A TREATISE OF Mr. Cottons,

Clearing certaine DOUBTS Concerning

PREDESTINATION.

Together with

AN EXAMINATION

Thereof; written by

William Twisse, DD.

Pastor of *Newbury*.

Prov. 19. 21. *There are many devices in mans heart; nevertheless the counsell of the Lord that shall stand.*

2 Cor. 4. 3. *If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.*

LONDON,

Printed by *F. D.* for *Andrew Crook*, and are to be sold at his Shop at the Signe of the *Green Dragon* in *Pauls* Church-yard. 1646.

1 Question ... Page 1
2 Doubt ... 33

Gen. Rec. 36 Atty 36 Dickinson

The Authors Epiſtle unto the Reader.

IT was my purpoſe and reſolution at the firſt, to let this piece, in anſwer to Mr. Cotton, paſſe without a preface; for it was put into a Stationers hand ere I was aware: Neither did I ſee the mans face untill the whole book was printed. And for certaine yeares I knew not what was become of it, which I imputed to the confuſion of theſe times. But ſo it was, that a Knight of our County, ſent over unto mee the Miniſter who lived in his houſe, to intreate me to communicate unto him my anſwer to a book, intituled, Gods love to mankind: which I condeſcended unto; willing to ſatisfie ſo noble a friend as Sir Francis Pile. The Miniſter perceiving this anſwer of mine to Mr. Cotton lying with it, deſired that hee might take that alſo along with him, that Sir Francis might have a ſight of that together with the other: whereunto I yielded, upon promiſe made, that both pieces ſhould be returned into my hands very ſhortly, within a moneth or two.

But evill times followed not long after, and for a whole year we were full of diſtractions in the Countrey. My thieſeſt care was, for the preſervation of my manuſcripts, which I brought with me to London at the firſt: But this piece in anſwer to Mr. Cotton was wanting; I had utterly for-

948444

gotten what was become of it. Sir Francis *removed to* South-hampton, *and took care of my copies to have them along with him. It was ſomewhat long ere they were brought to* London; *but in good time they arrived here ſafe and ſound. And* Mr. Gilbert, *who brought me the firſt word of it, ſhewed me withall that he was well acquainted with a* Stationer, *who would undertake for the ſetting forth my Anſwer to* Gods love to mankind: *Onely his deſire was, he might begin with the printing of my anſwer to* Mr. Cotton, *becauſe that was a ſmall piece. And thus ere I was aware, I came to underſtand, that my ſtray ſheep, which I gave for loſt, was found.*

And ſince that, conſidering certaine paſſages of divine providence, cauſing ſome interruption in the proceedings of bringing forth this Treatiſe unto the light of the preſſe: I have been moved thereby to prefixe this preface, partly on mine owne behalfe, and partly on the behalfe of Mr. Cotton: *For men may perhaps conceive me to be well pleaſed with an adverſative diſpotion, and to affect a courſe of oppoſition, as well to the friends of the Bridegroome, as to his enemies: As if I were like* Iſmael *in part, of whom it was ſaid, that* his hand was againſt every ones; *which is enough to make me like unto him in the other part alſo, and provoke* every one to have his hand againſt me. *Truth it is, all my writings, both printed and manuſcript, that have an eye towards the preſſe, are of a reſponſorious nature; but the originall motive cauſe unto me was meerely mine owne ſatisfaction; and that in the points of grace and predeſtination. In arguments of this nature, I promiſed to my ſelfe more comfort then I could expect in ſtudying Tranſubſtantiation, or Purgatory. And becauſe truth is never ſufficently known in a ſcholaſticall way, unleſſe we are able to maiſter the ſtrong-*

eſt

eſt oppoſitions that are made againſt it; therefore I gave my ſelfe to take notice of the greateſt ſticklers in their oppoſitions againſt that doctrine, which is maintained by our Divines: and all this meerely for mine own better progreſſion in the inveſtigation of truth, without the leaſt thought at that time of publiſhing ought. And for the ſame cauſe I ſet my ſelfe upon thoſe paſſages, which ſeemed to containe the greateſt difficultie: And therefore in examining Arminius, I began in the midſt of his anſwer to Mr. Perkins, to ponder well his digreſſion and diſcourſe about divine permiſſion; for in that argument I had found no ſmall difficultie; and I made tryall, whether by that diſcourſe of his I could find ſatisfaction; but I found no ſatisfaction at all from him; neither was I able to worke out ſufficient ſatisfaction to my ſelfe: about that matter was the firſt digreſſion I began with, but it was one of the laſt that I finiſhed.

Other diſcourſes of mine, many of them, yea, moſt of them, were written by me onely at the inſtance of others. My anſwer to Mr. Hords diſcourſe (which ſince is printed with Mr. Simſons additions, and ſet forth under the ſpecious title of Gods love to mankind;) was performed by me at the requeſt of Sir Nathaniell Rich. My anſwer to the Synod of Dort, after reduced to practiſe, was penned by me to ſatisfie friends, two copies thereof manuſcript being ſent unto me from ſcholar-friends in Oxford: but eſpecially I was glad, that I had ſo good an opportunitie thereby to quiet the ſpirit of my lord Say; his honour being not a little moved with the ſcoffing carriage of Tilenus, the Author of that piece (who dyed ſhortly after as I was advertiſed) and by his lordſhips honourable care it was brought forth to light. I could give the like account of many other pieces written by me, and imployed therein by others; many of them being

as meane in condition as my selfe. This very piece of Mr. Cottons, the answer whereunto is now put forth, I undertooke meerely upon the motion of Mr. Bets, a young Minister, who at that time lived at Broughton, in the house of my lord Say: he intreated me to take it into consideration, and shew my judgement concerning it: And to gratifie him I undertooke it; and my lord Say himselfe liked well of it, and communicated it unto Mr. Cotton, who carried it with him into New-England; whereby I was put to my shifts to get a copy of it as I could for mine owne use.

Now concerning Mr. Cotton, it may be his reputation will seeme to be touched in this; but let the indifferent Reader consider what I say in my observation. Both Austin and other great Divines have written freely and largely of Election, but very sparingly of Reprobation; the reason whereof I conceive to be this, There appeares more seeming offensive harshnesse in the doctrine of Reprobation, then in the doctrine of Election. Secondly, I am perswaded, they manifestly perceived, that by stating the doctrine aright in the point of Election, the truth, by just analogy and proportion, did there-hence necessarily follow in the point of Reprobation, to all judicious Divines. Now Mr. Cotton, as I have heard, is very sound and orthodox in the point of Election, and comes to this work with a gracious intent, to clear the doctrine of Predestination (and that in the speciall of Reprobation) from such harsh consequences as seeme to be derived there-hence; which doe very frequently break forth, as I have observed, when the order of Gods decrees is not stated aright: And by experience I have found the manifold odious imputations of strange harshnesse layd upon Gods proceedings, and represented by the Remonstrants in their Antisynodalia Dordracena, in number 10. as I remember; but they all vanish and come

to nothing upon the right ordering of Gods decrees: wherein, if any Divine faile, it may be his failing is only in a point of Logick, provided that he be orthodox in the point of grace; but if he be corrupt in that, then the more corrupt his Logick is, the better it may ſerve his turn for the countenancing of his erroneous wayes in matter of divinity.

Laſtly, I have been given to underſtand by Mr. Simſon, *one of the reverend Divines of the Aſſembly, that* Mr. Cotton *upon the receiving and peruſing this treatiſe of mine, ſeemed to be moved therewith not a little; and that in ſuch a way, as not to be provoked thereby, but rather to incline to the receiving of ſatisfaction.* Mr. Cotton *is a Divine whom I never ſaw; but ſo much I have heard of his pietie and parts of learning, that his name ſhall ever be of reverend remembrance with me. Nevertheleſſe, becauſe this diſcourſe of his, whereunto I addreſſe my anſwer, is in the hands of many, and ſome of them may be ſtrengthned in their erroneous wayes, by this writing of his; and I have heard, that certaine Arminians have taken advantage, to juſtifie them in their wayes, from ſome paſſages in this very diſcourſe of* Mr. Cottons: *Others, though orthodox, may hereby be miſled into errour, in ſuch ſort, as to corrupt both themſelves and their brethren into ſuch opinions (too pleaſing unto fleſh and bloud) as may ſhake the orthodox doctrin of Gods free grace, in the precious points of Election, Predeſtination, & Regeneration. This danger I deſire to prevent; and upon my knowledge, my labour and paines herein have bin taken in very good part, by thoſe who are the very good friends of* Mr. Cotton; *and ſome not his good friends onely, but great and right well approved of by* Mr. Cotton *himſelfe; they have deſerved no leſſe at his hands. The God of all grace, bring all his into an unitie of faith, in the acknowledgement of his grace, which is the onely ſure way unto glory.*

Faults in Printing correct thus.

Page 6. line 15. if read of. p 10. l 1. thus, r. this. p. 12 l. 25. contradictions, r. contradictious. p. 27 l. 18. Apostle, r. Epistle p. 33. l. 1. r. what was Gods. p. 38. l. 29. Question the 2. it should be Doubt the third: the want whereof made us suspect that the whole and intire Answer to the third Doubt was missing. p 39 l. last save one, hen, r. when. p. 40. l. last save one, confesseth, r. confesse. p. 43 l. 21 bought, r. brought. p. 52. l. 15. decrees to save, r. decree was to save. p. 57. l. the last, distinct, r. disjunct. p. 61. l. 33. distinct, r. disjunct. p. 76. l. 18. grants, r. grant. p 87. l. 9. after the word *feigne* there should be such a disjunction as this [;]. p 98. l. 12. objects, r. objection. p 114. l. the fourth from the end, controversies but; read it thus, controversies; but. p. 117. l. 16 manner, r. nature. p. 131. l. 18. rash, r. harsh. l. 19. rash, r. harsh. p. 182. l. 9. in his his purposes, r. in Gods purpose. p. 190 l. 27. r. obduration. p. 194. l. 17. like, r. life. p. 209. l. 26. objection, r. Objector. p 207. the fifth Doubt, Question the fifth, line the sixth and seventh seems to be obscure; but yet compared with the former, and well considered, the mist will break up, and the sense of the Author appeare. p. 209. l. 4. mans, r. man. p. 225. l. the fourth from the end, serves, r. seems. p. 227. l. 30. leave out the word *and* p. 234. l 30. effectuall, r. and effectuall. p. 236. l. the last, r. informe him. p. 237. l. 29. that without, leave out the word that. p. 239. l. 6. short of, r. short of them. p. 250. l. 3. speciall, r. specials. l. 13. Genius, r. genus. p. 254. l. 15. it, r. in. p. 255. Quest. 7. l. 10. of a grace, r. of grace. p. 267. l. 17. naturalls should, r. naturalls right, should. p. 282. l. 20. *agst*, r. *agst*. p. 284. the last line save five, sounding; reade soundnesse.

AN EXAMINATION of a Treatiſe written by Maſter *Cotton*, for the clearing of certaine doubts concerning *Predeſtination*.

QUESTION. I.

HOw may it appeare that there was any thought of the incarnation of the ſecond perſon, or advancement of the man Chriſt, before the preſuppoſall of the fall of man, and his owne humiliation.

Anſw. *God doth not propoſe one thing before another in time, all things are at once preſent with him: But the things purpoſed by God, God doth order them one for another, and ſo is he rightly ſaid to purpoſe one thing in order before another. Now in order of things, God hath firſt purpoſed the glorifying of himſelfe, yea, and the glorifying of himſelfe in Chriſt too, before he preſuppoſed the fall of man, and humiliation of Chriſt; as may appeare, &c.*

Exam. 1. I will firſt take into conſideration the doubt propoſed. Here are foure things mentioned: and the Queſtion is made touching the priority of the two firſt in reſpect of the two latter, and that in the thoughts (or intention) of God. And withall I conceive the incarnation of the Sonne of God is conſidered in reference to the fall of man. And the advancement of the man Chriſt in reference to his humiliation. Of the *Priority* of each in reſpect of his correlative proceeds the doubt. I thinke good to conſider them apart. As touching the firſt couple, the *incarnation of the Son of God*, and *the fall of man*: I ſhould anſwer at the firſt daſh, that there is no order between them at all: My reaſon is this; All order in intention hath courſe onely between the meanes and the end: But between theſe two there is no ſuch reference as between the means and the end. The propoſition is without queſtion;

the assumption I prove thus: It belongs to the same Author to be the Author, as of the end, so of the meanes tending to the end. (All experience justifies this.) But God (though he be the Author of the incarnation of his Sonne, yet) could not be the Author of the fall of man, as he cannot be the Author of sinne. But it is not fit so weighty a question should be strangled *unius verbi præjudicio*, with the prejudice of one word; therefore let the question proceed (with a little alteration) in comparison of the incarnation of the Sonne of God, and the permission of the fall of *Adam*, which undoubtedly was Gods work as well as the former. Some thinke the decree of the incarnation of the Sonne of God presupposeth the fall of man; or rather (to speake more accurately in a scholasticall discourse) the consideration of *Adams* fall, and consequently (though this be not alwaies considered) the decree of God to permit *Adams* fall. This order, though very generally received; yet it is contrary to manifest reason, according to the rule in this Treatise mentioned, and which I take to be most sound. For, if the permission of *Adams* fall were first in intention, then it should be last in execution, and consequently the Son of God should be first incarnate, and after this *Adam* should be permitted to fall. Others it seems (though very few that I have ever bin acquainted with) take another course, and presuppose Gods purpose touching the incarnation of his Sonne to precede his purpose touching the permission of *Adams* fall; yet not so much for the former reason, as for the honour of Christ. But this will be found upon true scanning, to be as contradictious to manifest reason as the former, and that upon the same ground. For, if God did purpose the incarnation of his Sonne before he purposed the permission of the fall of *Adam*, much more did he purpose the incarnation of his Sonne, before he purposed to permit the sinnes of all men, and particularly the sins of them that crucified the Sonne of God, *Act.* 2. 36. I say *much more*; onely to signifie that this is much more evident. But this is a thing impossible upon the former ground, and upon the former rule. For, if the incarnation of the Sonne of God were first in intention, then it should be last in execution; and consequently Christ should first be permitted by God to be crucified, and after this hee should be incarnate. 2. Againe, Did God decree that his Sonne should take humane flesh upon him indefinitely in respect of place where, and

time

time when? Or definitely at ſuch a time, and in the wombe of the Virgin *Mary*? Indefinite decrees are generally thought to be nothing becomming God. If definitely, how could this be without the conſideration of *Adams* fall? 3. If the decree of incarnation be advanced before the decree of permitting *Adam* to fall, why not before the decree of the creation alſo; and that not onely of men, but of Angels? Certainly it could not be before the decree of creating Angels: For priority in intention is onely of the end, in reference to the meanes; and certainly the creation of Angels, was no meanes for the incarnation of the Son of God. Now if the decree of incarnation were not before the decree of the creation of Angels, ſurely it was not before the decree of the creation of mankind. For the decree of the creation of Angels was in no moment before the decree of the creation of man: which I prove thus: If the creation of Angels were firſt in intention, it ſhould be laſt in execution, and conſequently man ſhould be created before Angels. Now if the incarnation of the Sonne, were not in intention before the creation of mankind in *Adam*, I will here-hence manifeſtly deduce, that the ſame incarnation of the Sonne of God was not any moment of nature in intention before the permiſſion of mans fall; for certainly creation of mankind in *Adam* was not: as I prove thus; If *Adams* creation were in Gods intention before the permiſſion of his fall, then ſhould it have bin laſt in execution; that is, man ſhould be permitted to fall into ſinne, before God created him.

Thus, looke by what reaſon it may appeare, that the permiſſion of *Adams* fall was not in Gods intention before the incarnation of the Sonne of God; by as good reaſon doth it appeare, that the incarnation of the Sonne of God was not in Gods intention before the permiſſion of *Adams* fall: whence it followeth, that the incarnation of the Son of God, and the permiſſion of *Adams* fall, together with his creation are not *ſubordinanda*, to be ſubordinated in Gods intention (as if any of theſe were the end which God intended, and the reſt meanes ordained to that end) but *co-ordinanda*, to be co-ordinated, as joynt means tending to a further end: and that is the manifeſtation of Gods glory in a way of mercy mixt with juſtice: Which end doth equally beſpeake all the three former as meanes tending thereunto. For, no declaration of Gods glory can be without creation, nor in the way of mercy without per-

misſion of ſinne and miſery, nor of ſuch a mercy as is mixt with juſtice, without the incarnation and paſſion of the Son of God.

2. As for the order of the other two, to wit the advancement of the man Chriſt, and his humiliation, thereof we are now to ſpeake. And firſt I confeſſe willingly, that his humiliation could not be intended before his exaltation, leſt, being firſt in intention, it ſhould be laſt in execution. I will further prove that his advancement or exaltation could not be intended before his humiliation. And firſt, this may be made evident as touching his greateſt advancement, which was by incarnation; all advancement following was farre inferior unto this. Now this advancement was not intended before his humiliation; for had it bin firſt in intention, it had bin laſt in execution, and conſequently Chriſt had been firſt humbled, and afterwards his nature taken into an hypoſtaticall union with the Sonne of God. Secondly I prove, that the advancement of his humane nature after his paſſion, was not in Gods intention before his humiliation. For I have already proved that the taking of the humane nature into an hypoſtaticall union with the Son of God, was not before his humiliation: and you will not ſay that the advancement of the man Chriſt you ſpeake of, was in Gods intention before his incarnation, therefore neither was it in Gods intention before his humiliation.

What remaines then, but that all theſe, to wit, the incarnation of the Sonne of God, his humiliation in the fleſh, together with his ſucceeding advancement, are not *ſub-ordinanda*, to bee ſub-ordinated in Gods intention, (as if onewere the end, and the other meanes tending to that end) but rather *Co-ordinanda*, to be co-ordinated; if not as joynt meanes tending to one and the ſame end throughout, yet as different meanes tending to different ends; or partly the one, partly the other: Still holding up this truth, that no order is to be found in intention between any but ſuch as have the reference of end and meanes amongſt themſelves. As for example, The incarnation of the Son of God is a ſole and ſingle means tending to the manifeſtation of the greateſt free grace of God that ever was or can be ſhewed to the world; his humiliation reſpects both our good and his owne. As it reſpects ours; together with his incarnation, it is a meanes to manifeſt the glory of God in ſaving us in deſpight of ſinne, and that in the way of juſtice. In reſpect of his owne good, together with his advance-

ment

ment, it is a joyne means for manifesting the remunerative justice of God, in rewarding him according to his deserts: in conformity to that of the Apostle, *Therefore hath God exalted him.* But neither this advancement of his, is the end of his humiliation, nor either of these the end of his assumption into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God: Nor his hypostaticall union with the second person in Trinity the end of any of these; and therfore they are to be accompted rather co-ordinate then subordinate in the intention of God. Phil. 2.

2. Now I come to examine how this doubt is cleered. Here we have first a rule, then the accomodation of this rule. Touching the rule I acknowledge it, and I adde something to the cleering of it. Granting that there is no order in Gods decrees, but such as is grounded upon this, that God purposeth one thing for another. This one thing and another are only the end and the means; between which we say, in the intention of God there is onely *prioritas rationis*, priority of reason; which in my judgement is well expounded thus: when *ratio unius petitur à ratione alterius*, the reason of the one is taken from the reason of the other; as *ratio mediorum petitur à ratione finis*, the reason of the means is taken from the reason of the end. And therefore we say, The end is first in intention, and then the meanes.

As for the accomodation of the rule, it seems to me to be nothing at all to the purpose; for the doubt proposed was not how it might *appeare that there was any thought of the glorifying of God, before the presuppofall of* Adams *fall, and of Christs humiliation.* We willingly acknowledge the glory of God was thought on before them all, both before the incarnation, advancement of the man Christ, mans fall, and Christs humiliation: I say, before them all, *prioritate rationis*, by priority of reason; for, undoubtedly, both the incarnation of the Son of God, That is, the hypostaticall union of Christs manhood to the second person in the Trinitie, and the advancement of the man Christ, was to the glory of God as the end thereof, as well as ought else. And this glory of God hath been specified at least in part. And as for the glorifying of himself in Christ, this still denotes the glory of God as the end, though it addes withall the matter wherein it shines, to wit, the man Christ. And to prevent the errour of equivocation, that usually lurkes under generalls. This glorifying of God in

Christ consists either in severall, or in common, with the glorifying of himself in man also; to wit, in the elect, considered in severall. I confesse there is a double glory of God, manifested in Christ: The one is the glory of his pure grace in conferring the greatest good and honour that the creature is capable of, as namely in the hypostaticall union of the manhood of Christ to the second person in the Trinitie.

Secondly the glory of Gods remunerative justice in the highest degree possible, both in respect of the reward, the greatest that possibly could be deserved (for that hypostaticall union could not be deserved) and that is the glorification of the humane nature of Christ, both in respect of his glory absolute, and of his glory relative, as by whom salvation is procured to others: as also in respect of the desert, the greatest I thinke that possibly could be, to wit, the humiliation of the Sonne if God to the death of the crosse in way of obedience to his Fathers will. There is also a glory of God that appeares in Christ, not in severall, as a sole meanes thereof, but in common with other meanes joyntly concurring thereunto: and that is the glory of God in the way of mercie mixt with justice, in saving sinners for the obedience of Christ. The glory of God in all these severall wayes was in the first place intended by God before ought else, *prioritate rationis*, in prioritie of reason; and afterwards the congruous meanes to these severall ends, as the ends them selves did bespeake, were intended by him: for *ratio mediorũ petitur à ratione finis*; the reason of the meanes is taken from the reason of the end. But all this is nothing to shew that the incarnation of the second person, or advancement of the man Christ, should be before the consideration of mans fall, or Christs humiliation. Yet let us examine that which followeth, delivered by way of proof of that which no man, that I know, makes question of.

Answ. 1. *Because Christ was ordained before the world was, therefore before the consideration either of Creation or Fall. For, in scripture phrase, when God is said to doe one thing before another, he meaneth before the existence or being of it in his consideration, as an inducement leading him unto it, as well as before the existence of it by nature: As when God is said to have* loved *Jacob* rather then *Esau* before they had done either good or evill. *Rom.* 9. 11. *He meaneth before they had done it* in his consideration, *as a cause or*

condition

condition leading him to love, or hatred, as well as in act mall performance in their owne persons.

I pray consider, why was Christ ordained, and to what end, before the world was? Was he not ordained to be incarnate in the womb of the Virgin, and to be a Lambe for a burnt offering, to make satisfaction for sins? And was it possible that this ordination could have course without consideration of the creation and fall? And though this be confessed, yet will it not here hence follow, that the decree of creation and permission of mans fall, was before the decree of the incarnation of the Sonne of God: which alone, as I conceive, casteth some mens inventions upon the platforme of a new course. And consequently it will not follow, that, in this case, the consideration of creation and fall should precede as motives to God to send his Sonne: For first, I say, the considerations hereof are not all precedent, but conjunct and concomitant, like as are the decrees. Secondly, if they did precede, yet should they not precede as motives. Good or evill workes are fit motives, I confesse, of election and reprobation, if it were possible their considerations could precede the one or the other: But creation and fall are no fit motives of ordaining Christ, (for they were found in Angels as well as in men) though the consideration of them could precede this ordination. 2. Election is as expresly said to be before the foundation of the world, as the ordination of Christ. And was not reprobation in opposition to election in the same moment of time and nature also? Doth not election connotate reprobation? But it will be said that this phrase, *before the world*, signifies not any measure of duration when that worke was done, but a negation of any consideration had of the creation or fall. This seems a very strange construction; therefore it deserves to be discussed. *Exam.*

3. *Before* Abraham *was I am*; would you interpret it thus: Before the consideration of *Abraham*, I am? *Before the Child shall have knowledge to eschew the evill, and to choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her Kings*, is the meaning hereof, before the consideration of the Childs knowledge to eschew the evill and to choose the good?

4. Is not this a manifest course to overthrow our best evidence of the eternitie of election and Christs ordination? For what evidence

dence doth the word of God affoord comparable to these? And we know that out of our selves some have risen, denying the eternitie of Gods decrees: and shall we do them such acceptable service, as in blasting such evidences as these that make against them? Then let us goe and interpret accordingly the Apostle, where he speakes of some thing promised πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, and say the meaning is, before the consideration of those χρόνοι αἰώνιοι, times consisting of many ages, or some thing in them, I know not what.

2 Tim. 1. 9.

5. I grant, *before they had done good or evill*, Rom. 9. is as much as before the consideration of any good or evill done by them. The text it selfe doth bespeake this meaning. But will it follow that, because *before they had done good or evill*, Rom. 9. is as much as *before the consideration of their good or evill workes*; the text bespeaking that sense, therefore, 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. where Christ is said to be ordained before the world, it is as much as to say, Christ was ordained before the consideration of the creation and fall; the text bespeaking no such interpretation, but rather resisting it, by the comparison made betwixt the ordination of Christ, and the declaration of Christ; the one said to be made before the foundations of the world, the other said to be made in these last times? as much as to say the one before all times, the other not till these last times: Times with times compared, not consideration of the creation and fall with these last times.

6. Again, the consideration of works, good or evill, are fit motives (as hath beene said) unto election and reprobation if they could precede them; but the consideration of the creation and fall, though preceding, yet is no fit motive to the ordination of Christ; wee well know they were found in Angels as well as in men. By the way, where I pray is it said, *that God loved Jacob rather then Esau*? I find it said *Rom. 9. that God loved Jacob and hated Esau*. But if you take liberty to interpret it thus, *He loved Jacob rather then Esau*; why may not I as well take liberty to interpret it thus, *God hated Esau rather then Jacob*? yet I confesse the former interpretation is made by *Cornelius de lapide* the Jesuite.

Answ. 2. *God chose us before the world in Christ our head*, Eph. 1. 4. *Therefore hee chose Christ also to bee our head before the world was. For if we be chosen in him, it implyeth that he, as our head, was chosen before us in order, and we in him. Now if we who*

were

were chosen in Christ, and so after Christ in order; if wee (I say) were chosen before the world, and so before the consideration either of creation or fall, how much more Christ, who was chosen before us?

In the allegation of Saint *Pauls* text, I find something left out that pertaines to the compleating of the sentence: for the sentence is this, *Who hath chosen us in Christ, that we should be holy*: Here the latter part of one entire sentence is quite left out. And by your dismembring it, the sentence is made causelesly obscure, and so the fitter to serve for advantages. This is *Arminius* course, *Exam.* Pag. 31. *Apostolus ait, nos in Christo electos esse*; The Apostle saith, we are elected in Christ. And as something in the text is left out: so something besides the text is put in, *God chose us before the world in Christ our head.* This likewise *Arminius* insists on, *Exam.* Pag. 158. And marke I pray you how he works upon each; *To be elect in Christ*, is with him, *to be elect being in Christ*: for, *nos in Christo*, with him is, *nos existentes in Christo.* And seeing we are not in Christ but by faith, hereupon he makes the object of election to be *fideles*, the faithfull; or *in Christum credentes*, such as believe in Christ. We answer: first, We may take as great libertie to interpret it, for explication sake, by supplying a participle of the future tense, thus, *elegit nos futuros in Christo*, he chose us hereafter to be in Christ: (like as it followes, *Who hath predestinated us to be adopted.* Now we are adopted by faith, *Gal.* 3. 26.) as he takes liberty to supply a participle of the present tense, especially, considering that when we were elect, to wit, before the foundation of the world, we were not at all, and consequently were not *fideles*, believers. Secondly wee answer, that the compleat sentence, considered at full, doth manifest in what sense this phrase [*in Christ*] is taken. *He chose us in Christ, that we should be holy*: This shewes to what wee were chosen, to wit, to obtaine holinesse, and how; to wit, in Christ, that is, for Christs sake; Like as *v.* 3. 'tis said, *God hath blessed us with all spirituall blessings in Heavenly things in Christ Jesus*: that is, for Christ his sake. And like as 1. *Thes.* 5. 9. 'tis said, *God hath ordained us to obtaine salvation thorough Jesus Christ*: So here in a conformable exposition, when it is said, *God hath chosen us in Christ, that wee should bee holy*; a faire meaning may be this, God hath ordained us to obtaine holinesse through Jesus Christ; especially considering that *Exam.*

grace is called ſalvation 2. *Tim.* 1. 9. as well as glory; And thus *Arminius* himſelfe falls upon *Exam.* Pag. 31. *Apoſtolus inquit, nos in Chriſto electos eſſe tanquam in mediatore, cujus ſanguine nobis ſalus parta eſt.* And thus the danger is fairely avoided of making Chriſt the cauſe of our election *quoad actum eligentis*, which not one of our Divines, that I know, maintains, ſave *Rolloc.* But *Arminius*, I confeſſe, labours for it tooth and naile, to no other end, but that ſo he may ſomewhat plauſibly bring in faith alſo, if not as a cauſe, yet as a pre-requiſite at leaſt of our election. And yet for all the noyſe he makes in this kind, calling Chriſt the foundation of our election, nevertheleſſe the iſſue is to confeſſe that all comes to this, that Chriſt is therefore the foundation of our election becauſe he is the meritorious cauſe *bonorum electione præparatorum*, of good things which are prepared by election; ſuch as he ſpecifies to bee grace and glory, as appeares both in his publique and private diſputations. Now, if in this ſenſe we are ſaid to be elect in Chriſt, that we ſhould be holy, then it is cleare, we are not elect in Chriſt *tanquam in capite*; for, *ratio capitis non eſt ratio cauſæ meritoriæ*, as *Arminius* himſelfe acknowledgeth, *Exam.* Pag. 3. *Apoſtolus inquit nos electos eſſe in Chriſto tanquam in mediatore, cujus ſanguine nobis ſalus parta eſt & vita*: there a way hath *cauſa meritoria*, his courſe. And then he addes, *& ut in capite, ex quo iſta bona ad nos derivantur.* So that *ratio capitis* with him is *ratio cauſæ efficientis*; not *moraliter*, but *phyſicè*: and therein he ſaith truth. Secondly, obſerve what he marks out of this, that we are all elect in Chriſt, *tanquam in capite*, for here-hence he will deduce, that we are elect in Chriſt *tanquam mortuo & reſuſcitato*, becauſe Chriſt was not made the head of his Church till after his reſurrection, building as it ſeemes upon that we read Epheſ. 1. 20. *Which hee wrought in Chriſt, when he raiſed him from the dead, and ſet him at his right-hand in heavenly places.* 21. *Farre above all principalities and powers, and every name that is named, not in this world only, but alſo in that that is to come*: 22. *And hath made all things ſubject under his feet, and hath given him over all things to be the head of the Church.* But theſe diſcourſes, if I be not deceived, have taken their originall from a ſaying of *Auſtin*, namely that *Chriſtus eſt prædeſtinatorum caput*, Chriſt is the head of the predeſtinate. Therefore I have taken paines to conſider the doctrine of *Arminius* hereabouts, conſiſting of three members. Firſt, Chriſt

is the head of the elect or predestinate. Secondly, our election made in Christ, is made in him as in our head. Thirdly, Christ is not our head but as he is dead, and raised; which, because it is much pertinent to the present purpose, I will not spare to set downe, though in another dialect: *Ratio illa altera de Christo considerato ut capite his membris, niti videtur &c.* See my *vindiciæ gratiæ Dei, lib. 2. crim. 24. digress. 10.* Pag. 74. col. 2. lin. 50. which was not set forth when I wrote this, but since it is.

2. But be it granted that we are chosen in Christ as our head; it followes not here-hence, that Christ Jesus was chosen in order before us. He was ordained to be a Lambe for a burnt offering to save us, and we were ordained to obtain salvation through him. What colour is here, why the former ordination should be conceived to go before the latter, and not rather the contrary; seeing our salvation is plainly intimated to be rather the end of his mission, incarnation and passion, then his mission, incarnation and passion to bee the end of our salvation? So *Ioh. 3. 16. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Sonne*; where the love of God to us men is designed as a motive with God for the giving of his Sonne; yet I doe not maintaine any such order, I have other reasons to overthrow that, and to bring both these ordinations to be co-ordinate, and not subordinate in the intentions of God. And indeed, as I have said, if the incarnation of the Son of God were in Gods intention, before the permission of the sins of the world, it would follow, that the permission of the sinnes of the world, even in crucifying Christ, should be first in execution, that is, Christ should be crucified before he was incarnate.

Answ. 3. *Christ is said in all things to have a preheminence, and God is said to dispose and carry his Counsels and waies towards the Church, that it might appeare,* Christ in all things to have the preheminence. Col. 1. 18. *God dealeth with us according to the Image of his dealing with him.* Rom. 8. 29. *And therfore in the Counsell of God, Christ had the preheminence to be first purposed, and the elect in him, and both them, and the other creatures for him, that so he might bee the first borne among many brethren. Its accounted somewhat a monstrous and unnaturall conception, the feet to be conceived in the wombe before the head: so were it alike unmeet and prepostrous course, the members of Christ to be first thought upon, and conceived in the wombe of the Counsell of Gods predestination, before the head Christ. If God*

ſhould have had no thought of the advancement of Chriſt man to the fellowſhip of the ſecond perſon to become man, till upon the preſuppoſall of the fall of Adam; *then were we not created for Chriſt, but Chriſt for us, contrary to that of the Apoſtle; And ſo Chriſt ſhall be brought into the world, as it were,* ens per accidens, *a thing by accident, upon occaſion of the fall.*

Col. 1. 16.

Exam. When once we have conceived an opinion, we are very prone to take hold of every thing that carrieth any ſhew of favouring it, howſoever it proves in the iſſue. Be it that he hath a preheminence in all things and a priority; but will you extend this to ſuch things as are not capable of priority? Is it not confeſt that God doth not purpoſe one thing before another in time? Is not the predeſtination of Chriſt, and of the elect all one act in God? onely as God ordereth one thing for another, ſo God purpoſeth one thing for another. Now which hath the preheminence in Gods predeſtination, whether that which is purpoſed for another, or that for which another thing is purpoſed? I preſume you will ſay, that for which another thing is purpoſed. why, then cõſider, whether the ſalvation of the elect be purpoſed for the incarnation & paſſion of the Son of God, or the incarnation & paſſion of the Son of God purpoſed for the ſalvation of Gods elect.

2. The preheminence the Apoſtle ſpeaks of is the preheminence of Chriſts perſon, not of the priority of predeſtination. Now the preheminence of a perſon alwaies preſuppoſeth the being of a perſon; for, to ſay a thing had a preheminence before it had any being, is a ſtrange phraſe, and contradictions. Therefore preheminence of any perſon is not to be looked for in predeſtination, which is rather in ordaining to preheminence, then containing preheminence: for we commonly ſay, that *Praedeſtinatio nihil ponit in praedeſtinato*, Predeſtination puts nothing in the perſon predeſtinated.

3. But come we nearer to the Apoſtle, *Col.* 1. 18. *that he might have the preheminence* ἐν πᾶσι· this ἐν πᾶσι is indefinite, and may be applyed two waies, as *Calvin* obſerves; *vel in omnes creaturas, vel in omni re*, either over all creatures, or in every thing. You take it as *in omni re*, in every thing, and indeed ſo the Engliſh tranſlation renders it; but if we find in ſcripture it ſelf this indefinite ἐν πᾶσι, or that which is equivalent thereunto defined, and that in ſpeaking of the preheminence of Chriſt, why ſhould we not comply with ſcripture in the accommodation of it in this place? Now in the other place alledged, *Rom.* 8. 29. its defined not to things but to perſons,

that

that Chriſt might be the firſt begotten ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, that is, among many brethren; why may we not then in like ſort render it here, that he might have the preheminence among all the children of God? So *Luke* 1. 28. *Bleſſed art thou among women*: So ἐν γυναιξὶ, *Inter omnes*: So *Piſcator*, *Ex cujus ſententiæ collatione pateſcit, illud* ἐν πᾶσιν *recte hic redditum eſſe, inter omnes. Phraſis græca eſt, ne quis putet vertendum eſſe, in omnibus, ſcilicet rebus*; and Beza, *Miminerimus de Chriſti in eccleſia regno cœpiſſe ab hoc verſiculo diſſerere, quod nemo negabit qui verba ipſa vel leviſſimè conſiderarit, ac proinde univerſali particula non aliud comprehendi quam omnes omnium temporum fideles.* And ſo *Anſelme* alſo, *Chriſtus primus eſt reſurgentium, ut in omnibus ſanctis, tam prioribus quam ſequentibus, teneat primatum dignitatis, potentiæ, ſanctitatis.* And *Lyra*, *ut ſic in omnibus primatum tenens, non ſolum reſpectu hominum, ſed etiam omnium Angelorum.*

4. But let it run in the neuter gender, of all things, as Beza confeſſeth it may be ſo taken, *poteſt quidem hoc accipi neutro genere, quum in proximo verſiculo ſcribat*; yet what meaning doth he make of it but this, *vera eſt* (ſaith he) *hæc univerſalis ſententia, Chriſtum inter omnia ſine ulla exceptione eminere?* making it ſignifie ſtill preheminence above or amongſt all things, but not in all things.

5. Taking it as in all things, *Ambroſe* interprets it thus, *ut ſemper in omni vita ſit primus & Princeps: in gratia & gloria* (ſaith *Aquinas*:) *In geneſi & reſurrectione*, (ſaith *Cajetan*:) *Tam in viſibilibus quam in inviſibilibus creaturis*, (ſaith *Hierome*.) Some practicall Divines extend it farre, interpreting it according to our Engliſh tranſlation; as, *firſt in time, firſt in order, firſt in the dignitie of the perſon, firſt in degree, firſt in government, firſt in acceptation with God, firſt effectively as the cauſe of all the reſpect, order, and excellency in others*, none extending it to predeſtination.

6. Nay, conſider whether the text it ſelfe be not againſt it, *He is the head of the body of the Church, the beginning, the firſt begotten of the dead, that in all things he might have the preheminence.* Now conſider, was Chriſt made the head of the body of the Church; was he the firſt begotten of the dead, to this end, that he might have the preheminence in predeſtination?

When it is ſaid, that the other creatures were for him, that *ſo he might be the firſt borne among many brethren*; I find want of

convenient proportion: for what did the being of other creatures for him further his primacie or eldership amongst many brethren?

It is true, all things were for him: but take the rest along with this; *all things are created by him and for him*: which clearly hath reference to his Godhead, one with the Father and holy Ghost, as *Rom.* 11. *From him, and by him, and for him are all things*: and *Heb.* 2. 10.

It is, I confesse, Maister *Baynes* his conceit, that it is as unmeete and prepostorous for the members of Christ to be first thought upon in the wombe of Gods counsell in predestination, as it is accompted monstrous and unnaturall for the feete to be conceived in the wombe before the head. And is it not as unnaturall to have the feete brought forth before the head? Yet we know many thousands of Christs members were brought forth, both into the world of nature, and into the world of grace, before the man Christ. Yet am not I of their mindes that thinke that any was elect before the predestination of Christ. I say with *Aquinas*, *si consideretur praedestinatio Christi & nostra, quantum ad actum praedestinantis, sic una non est causa alterius, quia idem non est causa sui ipsius; sed eodem actu divino praedestinatus est Christus & nos: ergo praedestinatio Christi non est causa nostrae praedestinationis. Si verò consideretur quoad effectum & terminum, cum effectus nostrae praedestinationis sit gratia, & gloria, & adoptio filiorum; sic dicendum, quod utraq; praedestinatio Christi causa est praedestinationis nostrae & efficiens & exemplaris.* And I hope 'tis nothing unmeet that God should at once thinke of Christ and his elect; as at once he thought of Angels & wormes; especially considering that Christ and his elect are correlatives; as he the head and they his mysticall body. Nay at once God did from everlasting both know himselfe, and know all things in himselfe. Yet I am perswaded the chiefest motive to devise a prioritie of Christs predestination before others, was only this conceite, that if it be not *prior*, it must needs be *posterior*. But I have endeavoured in briefe to shew here (as elsewhere more at large) that the predestination of Christ is neither *prior* nor *posterior* to the predestination of the elect. And indeed most are so pusled about devising a right place for the predestination of Christ amongst the decrees of God, that usually that is left quite out, because they know not where to finde a fit place for it: and all because they presume he must be predestinate either

before

before the decree of creation and permiſſion of ſinne, or after; neither of which can hold water, but they are both equally removed from the truth.

Where we are ſaid to be created for Chriſt, it is joyntly ſaid, we were created by Chriſt, which undoubtedly proceeds of Chriſt as God. And if *Adam* had not fallen, but the world of mankind ſtood in integrity, what glory had redounded to the man Chriſt more by our creation, then by the creation of Angels?

Though God had decreed the advancement of the man Chriſt upon preſuppoſall of *Adams* fall (which yet I hold to be impoſſible) yet this had not hinderd but we had been created for Chriſt, and that divers wayes: 1. To reape benefit by him after our fall. 2. To be of the number of thoſe over whom the man Chriſt ſhould one day rule, if not in grace (for thouſands were out of that ſtate before Chriſt man had any being) yet in glory. 3. As alſo to glorifie him both in this world (though this is verified of thoſe only who were brought forth after his incarnation, for Chriſt man had no being before, and conſequently could not be glorified before) and in the world to come. Yet it cannot be denyed, but that Chriſt alſo was both incarnate, and lived, and died for us and for our ſalvation, though that of the Apoſtle which you mention is nothing to this purpoſe, as ſpoken of Chriſt God, and not of Chriſt man.

Undoubtedly, Chriſt came into the world upon the occaſion of mans fall, for he came into the world as a Phyſitian, and to call ſinners unto repentance; which had beene meerely in vaine, had not ſinne entred into the world by *Adam*.

It doth not follow, that if we were not created for Chriſt, but Chriſt for us, then Chriſt ſhould be brought into the world as *Ens per accidens*; for the heavens and the earth, together with the lights of the one, and herbes and trees of the other, and bruit beaſts, were created for man and not man for them; yet neither of them all were brought forth as *Ens per accidens*: yet, had they beene brought forth *per accidens*, never-a-whit the more had they been *Entia per accidens*; *Entia per ſe* may be brought forth *per accidens*: to be *Ens per accidens* is one thing, and to be brought forth *per accidens* is another thing.

It had been more tolerable to argue thus; If Chriſt had been brought forth into the world only upon occaſion of *Adams* fall, then he had beene brought forth *per accidens*; yet no truth had

beene

beene found in it; for upon occaſions wiſe-men doe work, and proceed deliberately and with counſell, not temerariouſly; only man, not forſeeing the events of things, doth many times (upon emergent occaſions which himſelfe could not foreſee) alter his former counſels, and caſt himſelfe upon new deliberations. It is otherwiſe with God, as who infallibly foreſeeth all things, and not only fore-ſeeth them, but ordaineth they ſhall come to paſſe as well as he ordaineth cauſes and effects. For, not the things themſelves are ordained by God, but alſo the very order of them; ſome to bee effects, ſome cauſes, ſome occaſions. And ſo the very fall of *Adam* was both fore-ſeen and fore-ordained by God to come to paſſe; but how? Not as good things which he ordaineth to come to paſſe, *ipſo faciente*, himſelfe working them; but as all evill things which are ordained alſo to come to paſſe, but *Deo tantummodo permittente qua mala ſunt*, God only permitting them as they are evill; according to that of *Auſtin, Non aliquid fit niſi Omnipotens fieri velit, vel ſinando ut fiat, vel ipſe faciendo. Enchirid.* 95. And according to the 11. article of *Ireland, God did from all eternitie ordain whatſoever in time ſhould come to paſſe.*

Anſw. 4. *That which is firſt in the intention of every agent, is laſt in execution. Now the glory of Chriſt is laſt in execution (ſave onely the glory of the Father;) And therefore ſurely it was Gods firſt and chiefeſt intendment, after the glorifying of himſelfe, to glorifie Chriſt, before the conſideration of glorifying us, either in the firſt or ſecond Adam,* Pſal. 2. 9, 10, 11. *It is true, in fulnes of time Chriſt was firſt humbled, that he might be glorified; but yet in Gods counſell (wherein the end in order is firſt purpoſed, before the meanes leading to that end) the glorious advancement of Chriſt was firſt purpoſed, before the preſuppoſall of his humiliation, which made way for it. The Apoſtle deſcribing the ſubordination of things one to another, in the order wherein God hath ſet them; the world to be for the Church, and the Church for Chriſt, and Chriſt for God; he thereby gives us to underſtand, God firſt intended his glory, for which are all things, and then Chriſts, for whom the Church is, and then the Church, for which the world is, and then the world laſt of all.*

Exam. 1. Here we have an argument, and a place of ſcripture wherewith it is backt: I will conſider them ſeverally.

1. As for the argument; that is grounded upon ſuch a rule as

I desire no better direction for the right ordering of Gods decrees, which is the matter wee have in hand; but in the prosecuting of the argument in hand, upon this rule, I find no soundnes, no truth, neither in the matter nor in the method. For first, though the rule be proposed only of two, the first and last; yet in the exemplification there is mention made of three, as if the rule did not only extend to first and last; but also to former and latter, how many wayes soever they are in subordination; that looke what subordination they have in execution, the contrary subordination they should have in intention; which will be found contrary to all reason: As for example, the last of the good of man is his glory, but how? Both of body and soule in the resurrection. But before this there was a glory of the soule in departure from the body, or a blessed condition of it, accordingly as they are called *the spirits of just men perfected, Heb.* 12. and they enjoy Christs presence, 2 *Cor.* 5. Now shall we say, that in Gods intention was the glory of body and soule, jointly first, and secondly the glory of the soule in departure from the body? Come we to the state of grace, there we have in execution, first effectuall calling unto faith, and repentance, after this perseverance finall in both; shall we therefore say, God did first intend to give them perseverance in faith and repentance, and then intend to give them faith and repentance? Or that God did first intend to give them repentance, secondly intend to permit them to sinne? After this manner, I confesse, *Piscator* had sometimes ordered Gods decrees, wherein upon due examination I have scarce found one member sound: But see the issue of it; upon latter thoughts he fell quite off from this order, and embraced the contrary in every particular, and so recompenced his extream rashnesse with extream loosnesse. And no marveile, for truth alone is stable; as for error, it is a slippery thing, there is no stabilitie in it. Secondly here is nothing but miserable confusion throughout: First in the word *glory*; for the glory of the Father is delivered in one sense, our glory in another sense. And as for the glory of Christ, in what sense that is delivered, is utterly uncertaine; as whether in conformitie to the glory of the Father, or in conformitie to our glory, or in conformitie to both, which will be so much the more equivocall: by that which goes before, it may seeme to be spoken in conformitie to the glory of God the Father; as when it is often inculcated, that all things were made for him: by that which

meth after, it may seeme to be spoken in conformitie to our glory; as when it is said, the glorious advancement of Christ was first purposed. Againe, the glory of God the Father is in very great varietie; and therefore it behooved to be specified in what kind the glory of God herein specified is to be understood: as I will shew in the first place, when I come to oppose it particularly.

Secondly the glory of Christ is very ambiguous, both in respect of his person, as whether it be spoken of him in respect of his Godhead, or of his manhood; and it is nothing fitt these should be confounded: as also in respect of the word *glory* it selfe; for it is to be doubted (as before I said) whether it be spoken in conformitie to the glory of the Father, or in conformitie to our glory. And out of such a masse of confusion what satisfaction can be expected in any distinct and particular truth? 3. I see no reason why the glory of Christ only should be considered as the meanes of advancing the glory of God the Father. I conceive the glory of God is as much seen in the abasing of his Sonne, as in his exaltation; and if this very abasing of himselfe be called his glory, as indeed it may; for even on the crosse *he spoyled principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly, and triumphed over them*, Col. 2. then this discourse shall labour with a new æquivocation. In like sort, Is nothing but our glory a fit meanes to advance the glory of Christ, and of God? Is not God glorified as well in the martyrdome of his Saints? *This is my confidence* (saith Paul) *that God shall be glorified in my body, whether by life or by death*, Philip. 1. yea and Christ also; *Even when we beare about us the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life of Jesus might also be made manifest in our bodies.* 2 Cor. 4. 10 If our glory also be extended unto martyrdome, this is a very sore æquivocation, especially considering how the scripture doth distinguish them: *first to suffer, then to enter into glory*, Luk. 24. 26. *and if we suffer with him, we shall also reigne with him*, 2 Tim. 2. 12. 4. But as it lyeth, let us discusse it as well as we can. Therfore I say, first, Gods glory is not onely last in execution, but first also; even from the very first creation, even then *when the stars of the morning praysed him, and all the Sonnes of God rejoyced*, Job 38. 7. And I will deale plainely, and shew what glory of his was manifested herein, to wit, the glory of his *power*, Revel. 4. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all*

things, and for thy wills ſake they have beene and are created. Yea and his wiſdome alſo, *Pſal.* 130. 5. *which by his wiſdome made the heavens.* Jeremiah puts them both together, *He hath made the earth by his power, and eſtabliſhed the World by his wiſdome, and hath ſtretched out the heavens by his diſcretion.* And as in the creation, ſo the ſame glory of God doth ſend forth its beames in the preſervation and governance of all things. In the meaneſt creatures we behold the glory of God; neither are we able to comprehend the wiſdome of God therein; every thing therein, as in a Bee or ſilke-worme, coming to paſſe by courſe of nature; yet who is able to give a reaſon of it? I thinke, if *Solomon* had continued to this day, and his wiſdome with him, yet had he not beene able to finde it out; for although *the ſpirit of man be as the lampe of God,* Verſ. 20,27. *which ſearcheth all inwardneſſe, and God hath ſet the world in mans heart, yet is he not able to finde out the worke that he hath* Eccleſ. 3. 11. *wrought from the beginning to the end.* I behold the flowers of my garden, in great varietie of colours; yet wonder at their uniformitie; each ſingle one hath five leaves, each moſt uniforme in the colour, in the ſhape, riſing, and ſpreading, and indented alike in their edges; all together make a moſt comely proportion of the whole round in forme, only indented in the edges, which is as bonelace to ſet it forth, ſome of one colour throughout the pageant, ſpeckled, having ſtrakes like lines, ſo direct and proportionable in all, that it repreſents unto me ſome curious Mathematicall circle cut thorough with lines, the matter of many curious demonſtrations. And what a curious ſpeculation would it appeare to repreſent the cauſes of all this varietie? In the meane time, our contemplation is broken off, and loſeth it ſelfe, and turnes into admiration at the wiſdome of God, which confounds us in the contemplation of a flower, which is worn in the breaſt at morning, and troden under foot at night. But to returne, you will ſay, Another kind of glory is ſeene in the advancement of Chriſt; but then you ſhould have ſpecified it: which had you done, I doubt not but it would have afforded good matter to have wrought upon in the inveſtigation of truth. 2. As the glorifying of God the Father was the very firſt, even from the creation, before either Chriſt man was, or we; ſo I ſay, it is not ſo laſt, as if it ſhould be after Chriſts glory, and our glory ſhall ceaſe to be; for certainly, the glory of Chriſt, and the glory of the elect ſhall continue for ever;

and the glory of God cannot continue any longer then for ever.

3. Come wee to the consideration of the glory of Christ: There is a glory of Christ which he receiveth from man, and there is a glory of Christ which hee receiveth from God: That glory which hee receiveth from man, he hath received in greatest part long before wee were born; for it is the Fathers pleasure, *That all men should honour the Sonne, as they honour the Father*, Joh. 5. 23. There is the Rule: here followeth the Example; *Worthy is the Lambe that was killed to receive power, and riches, and wisdome, and strength, and honour, and glory, and praise. And all the creatures which are in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Praise, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for evermore*, Revel. 5. 12, 13.

As for the glory which he receives from his Father, that he hath already received above 1500. yeers agoe. *I have overcome, and am sate with my Father in his Throne*, Revel. 3. *If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorifie him in himselfe, and shall straight-way glorifie him*, Ioh. 13. 32. So that every way the glory of Christ, is afore ours, not after ours; for when the elect are once glorified, their glory shall continue for the time to come as long as Christs glory: but for the time past, certainely, Christs glory and his advancement, you here speak of, (noting thereby what you meane by Christs glory in this place) was long before ours. Whereas you say, that *Christ, as man, was first humbled, before hee was glorified*; if we consider the greatest advancement of Christ, it is untrue; for his greatest advancement was the assuming of his nature into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God, and this was afore his humiliation in the sense you speake of, to wit, in *humbling himselfe to the death, even to the death of the Crosse*: though I willingly confesse, the humiliation of the Godhead went joyntly along with the advancement of the manhood, even to this hypostaticall union. You say, *His advancement was purposed before his humiliation*. I deny it: You will say, that was the meanes tending to his advancement, as the end, (for so I take your meaning to be, leaving the consideration of the phrase mentioned *of making way*; which if it be delivered in any other sense then to signifie the meanes of his advancement, will make your cause worse, and nothing better.)

For

For now I deny that Christs humiliation was the meanes of Christs advancement; and I prove it: Those only are to bee accounted meanes to such an end, *quorum ratio petitur a ratione finis designati*, that is, the means are onely such as the nature of the end, duly considered, doth bespeake: But the advancement of Christ doth not bespeake any such meanes; for, undoubtedly, God could advance Christ without any such humiliation: nay, having taken his manhood into an hypostaticall union with his Son, even in this respect his advancement was far more requisite, than in respect of his humiliation. You will say, God purposed to advance him no other way then this. I grant it: and if you consider it well, you shall find the reason of it, by considering the right ends hereof in the counsell of God: And these are different; one was in respect of others, to wit, that he might be a fit Saviour of Gods elect: not that their salvation was the end of his humiliation; but the glory of God, in a certain kind, the end of both, to wit, both of his humiliation and our salvation; namely, the glory of his free grace, in the way of mercy mixt with justice. This end required satisfaction, as without which it could not be procured. But here, I confesse, the advancement of Christ hath no place: but in another consideration it shall find place, and that as a joynt meanes together with his humiliation; for another kind of glory would God the Father manifest in Christ: (And, indeed, the Nation of mankind is as a glasse, wherein a very complete body of Gods glory doth appear, in very great variety:) and that was, the manifestation of his glory in the way of remunerative justice, in the highest degree remunerating obedience: I say, in the highest degree, both in respect of the reward deserved, and also in respect of the desert it selfe: the reward being the sitting in the Throne of his Father, and to have all judgment committed unto the Sonne; the desert being the obedience of the Son of God, one and the same God with his Father, humbling himselfe to death, even to the death of the crosse, for the salvation of Gods elect. But perhaps you may further say, It is not necessary that the means should bee only such as the end doth naturally require; For, God could have brought man to salvation the same way he brought Angels, without faith and repentance; yea, hee could have made them, and immediatly have translated them into glory: yet wee commonly say, Faith and Repentance are the means of salvation. I answer, granting not onely that wee com-

monly say so, but that wee truly say so, in respect of our selves; namely, that as salvation is the scope and end wee aime at, so faith and repentance are the onely meanes to bring us thereunto; but in respect of God it is utterly untrue; for neither is our salvation the end of Gods actions, but his owne glory: *Hee made all things for himselfe*, Prov.16.4. And if it were his end, hee could have brought it about divers other wayes besides this: but in that hee brings it to passe this way, there is good reason for it, as wee shall well perceive, if wee take the end of God aright, namely, to manifest his glory in doing good to man in the highest degree, and that in the way of mercy mixt with justice. This end doth necessarily require a permission of sin; again, it doth require satisfaction, as by the death of Christ; and thirdly, it doth require faith and repentance, that so hee may doe him good, by way of reward; and lastly, a glorious salvation, which is the doing of him good in the highest degree. And as mans salvation is not the end of Gods actions, so neither is the glory of Christ, as hee is man, the end of Gods actions; for such a glory inherent can but bee a created glory, and no created thing can be the end of Gods actions; but onely God himselfe: For, as he is the chiefe efficient of all, so must hee bee the supreme end of all: and as hee is most lovely, and most good; so must hee necessarily love that most which is most lovely, even himselfe, and aime at his owne glory in all.

2 Now I come to the Apostles Text, wherewith this Argument is backt, 1 Cor.3.22,23: *All are yours, and yee Christs, and Christ Gods*: that is, say you, *The world for the Church, and the Church for Christ, and Christ for God*: thereby giving us to understand, That God first intended his glory, for which are all things; and then Christ, for whom the Church is; and then the Church, for which the world is; and then the world last of all. But, I pray you, consider whether this Interpretation, and Collection thereupon, be not more superficiary than sound: First, when he saith, *All are yours*, is the world only to be understood by *all*? Is not the world expresly named but as a member of this universall? Are not *Paul*, *Apollos*, and *Cephas* also joyned with it; together with life, and death, and things present, and things to come, and joyntly comprehended under the word *all*? Verse 21. *Let no man rejoyce in men, for all things are yours*, Verse 22. *Whether it be Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death; whe-*

the-

ther they be things present, or things to come, even all are yours, 23. *And yee Christs, and Christ Gods.* As he was perſwaded, Rom.8.38. *That neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come,* 39. *Nor heighth, nor depth, nor any other creature, ſhould bee able to ſeparate us from the love of God, which is in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord;* and therefore wee need not feare them: So here he goes further, and tells us, that all are put, as it were, in ſubjection unto us, to worke for our good; and therefore wee ſhould not rejoyce in them, but rather in Chriſt, and in God, who hath wrought this, and ordered all this for our good, through the merits of Chriſt: not only Apoſtles and Paſtours, but even the very Angels alſo, who pitch their tent about us, and have charge given them, to keep us in all our wayes; and all of them are ſent forth for the good of them that are heires of ſalvation: Yet this ſubjection is onely of a ſpirituall and gracious nature, nothing prejudicing their advancement above them whom they thus ſerve in love; and that for this their ſervice performed for Gods ſake, to whom rather they are in ſubjection then unto us; yet ſo farre in ſubjection to worke our good, that it becomes us not to rejoyce in any of them, but rather in God, who hath thus ordered them for our good, and Chriſt for whoſe ſake they are thus ordered: An Argument, like to that the Lord uſeth, Deut.4.19. *Take heed leſt thou lift up thine eyes to heaven, and when thou ſeeſt the ſunne, and the moon, and the ſtarres, with all the hoſt of heaven, ſhouldſt bee driven to worſhip them, and ſerve them.* Now marke the reaſon whereupon the Lord dehorts them from this, *which the Lord thy God hath diſtributed to all people under the whole heaven:* as much as to ſay, God hath made them to doe you ſervice, therefore doe not you make them your gods: So Paſtours, and Apoſtles, and Angels, are made by God to doe us ſervice, therefore let not us make them our gods. Thus wee ſee plainly by *All*, in this place, not the world only, but the Church of God is ſignified; every one of them being made to doe ſervice unto the Church, that is, one unto another; For, are they not all members of one body, though ſome performe more honourable ſervice then others? like as in a naturall body, ſome members are more honourable, and for more honourable uſes than others. Unleſſe wee thus underſtand it, wee ſhall exclude the Apoſtles out of the Church. And when it is ſaid, *We are Chriſts*, this ſeemeth not

not to admit the same sense with the former; for, undoubtedly, Christ is as much for our good as any, nay more then all the world, the Apostles, and Angels, and all; *for unto us hee was born, unto us hee was given*, Esa. 9. 6. given by the Father, *Joh.* 3. 16. given by himselfe, and that for us, *Tit.* 2. 14. *Gal.* 2. 20. and that *to dye for our sinnes, and rise againe for our justification*, Rom. 4. and, *to redeeme us from all iniquity, and to purge us a peculiar people unto himselfe, zealous of good works*, Tit. 2. 14. and that *by his bloud*, 1 Joh. 1. 7. Revel. 1. 5. Wee are therefore his, not so much in respect of any good wee bring to him, but in respect that hee hath bought us; And so we are Gods too, as, *Who sent his Son to redeem us unto God his Father*, Revel. 5. 9. *Yee are bought with a price, therefore glorifie God in your bodies, and in your spirits for yee are Gods*, 1 Cor. 6. 20. And Christ is Gods in speciall manner; as touching his Godhead, the naturall Sonne of God; as touching his Manhood assumed into an hypostaticall union with his naturall Sonne: in both, the Chiefe Servant of God, for the work of mediation and redemption, for Gods elect, given by the Father unto him, that he might bestow eternall life upon them, *Joh.* 17. 2. according to the good pleasure of his Father, *Mat.* 10. 40. Thus I have been bold to deliver my judgement touching the Interpretation of this place, without consulting any Interpreter; onely the native genius of the Text it selfe seemed to afford sufficient light, and evidence, to discerne the meaning thereof; which I willingly submit to the judgement of any.

Answ. *It is no part of my meaning to dispute, much lesse to determine, whether Christ should have been incarnate, if* Adam *had never fallen: I conceive it a question no lesse frivolous, then curious. The purpose of glorifying Christ, though it presuppose not the creation or fall of man, as making way for such an intention in God, yet doth it enforce the creation and fall of* Adam, *as making way for this purpose.*

Exam. Nothing, usually, doth cause more perturbation and hinderance in the inquisition of truth, than incommodious expressions: *The purpose of glorifying Christ* (say you) *presupposeth not the creation and fall.* No marvell, for the creation and fall are things temporall; but Gods purposes are eternall. Again, such a purpose (you say) *doth not make way to any such intention*: This phrase, *such intention*, is spoken in reference to the creation and fall; as if they

were intentions, which indeed they are not; but rather executions of intentions: it ſhould run thus, *As making way for the intentions of ſuch things in God.* Purpoſe and Intention ſignifying the ſame, it is good to keep our ſelves in one ſentence to the uſe of one of them, leſt wee expoſe our Readers to diſtraction, poſſibly ſuſpecting they may have different ſignifications. Your meaning, queſtionleſſe, is this, *Gods intention of glorifying Chriſt doth not preſuppoſe the intention of creation or fall of* Adam: And I am of your mind in this. But your meaning containes two things more, whereof the firſt is this, *Gods intention of the creation and fall, doth preſuppoſe his intention of glorifying Chriſt*: The ſecond is this, *Gods intention of glorifying Chriſt, doth inferre the intention of creation and fall of* Adam. As in both theſe I differ from you, ſo I will endeavour to diſprove your opinion in both. And firſt, I prove that the intention of glorifying Chriſt, was not before the intention of creation, and permiſſion of *Adams* fall. For although this may ſeeme plauſible, for as much as thus the glorifying of Chriſt, as it is firſt in intention, ſo alſo ſhall it be moſt congruouſly laſt in execution; yet according to this very rule, the iſſue will fall more foule then you are aware of; For, to begin with the Creation; if the glorifying of Chriſt were before creation, then alſo was it much more before the generation of all mankind: but this will appeare to be moſt untrue, by the ſame rule; for, if in compariſon of the glorifying of Chriſt, with the generation of all mankind, the glorifying of Chriſt was firſt in intention, then accordingly it ſhould bee laſt in execution, which is moſt untrue; for that of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. 2. *Wee ſee Jeſus crowned with glory and honour*, was delivered above 1500. years agoe, and yet the generation of all mankind is not in execution. Again, if the glorifying of Chriſt were firſt in intention, then was it the end, and the generation of all mankind ſhould be as the meanes tending to the furthering of that end; but what, I pray, doth the generation of a little child of mine tend to the furtherance of the glory of Chriſt, wherewith hee was crowned above 1500. years agoe? Come we to the permiſſion of *Adams* fall: I ſay, the glorifying of Chriſt was not in intention before this, though it ſeems never ſo plauſible in reſpect of congruity in execution; for, by reaſon of incongruity, in the very ſame kind, I diſprove it thus; If the glorifying of Chriſt were in Gods intention before the permiſſion of *Adams* fall, then

much more was it before the permission of other mens sinnes in Gods intention; but this is most untrue, upon the very same ground: For, if in comparison between the glorifying of Christ, and the permission of all mens sinnes to the end of the world, the glorifying of Christ were first in Gods intention, then should it be last in execution; which is most untrue: for the glorifying of Christ was accomplished above 1500. years agoe, as hath been shewed; but the permission of all mens sinnes, to the end of the world, is not yet in execution. Again, if the glorifying of Christ were first in intention, then should it have *rationem finis*, and the permission of all mens sinnes, to the end of the world, should be a congruous meanes to that end: but to averre this were most unreasonable; for what furtherance doth my sinnes this day and houre afford to the glorifying of the Sonne of God, which was accomplished 1500. years agoe? If it be replyed, that this glorifying of Christ is spoken in reference to a glory of Christ which is yet to come, to wit, the kingdome of Christ which wee look for, 2 *Tim.* 4.1. I answer, there is no reason why it should have any particular reference unto that; for as much as that glory shall have an end: For that kingdome shall continue but for a while; *Hee must raigne till hee hath put all his enemies under his feet*, 1 Cor. 15.25. And, *When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Sonne himselfe bee subject to him that did subdue all things under him, that God may be all in all*, Verse 28. Againe, if the glorifying of Christ were in Gods intention before the permission of *Adams* fall, then were it before the permission of reprobates to fall in *Adam*, as well as of Gods elect, and consequently before the permission of all sinnes of the reprobates, unto the end of the world, and before their generations; and all these should be first in execution, as meanes tending to the furthering and promotion of the glory of Christ. Secondly, I deny that the intention of glorifying Christ doth inferre either the creation of *Adam* or his fall; yet, by the way, I am glad to see you acknowledge, that the intention of the end doth inferre the intention of congruous meanes: But seeing, by that I have already shewed, it must inferre as well the generation of all mankind, to the end of the world; therefore, I pray, what colour of reason can bee devised, why it should inferre the generation of such a number of men as shall be, precisely, rather then more or lesse? So in respect of permission of *Adams* fall, I have already proved,

proved, that the glorifying of Christ must be before the permission of mens sins, to the end of the world, as well as of *Adams* fall, and consequently inferre that as well as the other: And what colour of reason can be given, why it should precisely inferre the permission of just so many mens sinnes, and just so many sinnes of such men as shall bee to the end of the world, neither more nor lesse? Againe, if the intention of glorifying Christ doth inferre *Adams* fall, then seeing by denying the Consequents the Antecedent must bee as justly denyed, it followeth manifestly, that if *Adam* had not sinned, Christ had not been glorified, and consequently, had not been advanced to an hypostaticall union with the second person in Trinity: And yet to make question thereof, you professe to bee no lesse frivolous than curious. I confesse, it is rather frivolous than curious to draw that into question, the negative whereof doth evidently follow upon that which is positively received. Againe, others, of the same opinion with you, are driven to take notice of this Question, for to derive this opinion of yours from a more ancient originall than Mr. *Baynes* upon the Apostle to the *Ephesians*, *Petrus Alphonsus Mendoza*, a Spaniard, maintaines the same; A Doctor of the Chaire in the University of *Salamanca*, not of *Moses* Chaire, nor of *Pauls* Chaire, no nor *Austins* Chaire, nor of *Aquinas* Chaire, but of *Scotus* Chaire; whose opinion is to be seen in his first Theologicall Controversie, printed 42. years agoe; and what his opinion was, appears by these conclusions:

1. *Omnium quæ Deus ab æterno in mente sua facere excogitavit, primum fuit, unio hypostatica verbi divini: Secundum, prædestinatio omnium electorum: Tertium, naturæ rerum conditio. Ac proinde priora sunt supernaturalia quam naturalia, & ordo naturæ præsupponit ordinem gratiæ.*

2. *Nullius futuri præscientia præsupponitur in mente Dei ad prædestinationem, sed omnia ex ipsa sequuntur: atque adeò nihil prorsus ab æterno decrevit Deus facere, vel in tempore facit, nihil permittit, sive intendit, sive naturale, sive supernaturale, sive res sit magni ponderis, sive minimi & fere nullius, quod non inde proveniat, sitque effectus & medium prædestinationis electorum & Christi. Atque adeò omnia cadunt sub ordine divinæ prædestinationis, tanquam media ad Christi & sanctorum gloriam ordinata.*

3. *Non est aliqua alia providentia in Deo antecedens prædestinationem, ex qua, scil. providentia, proveniant res naturales & quidam alij effectus supernaturales; sed unica est duntaxat providentia, ipsaque est prædestinatio, ex qua omnia in universum nullo prorsus excepto, habent sequi. Atque adeò juxta hanc conclusionem totum universum ut complectitur, naturalia & supernaturalia, bona & mala, substantias & accidentia, & omnes in universum modos essendi & operandi, non solùm in generali, sed in specie & individuo, sunt consideranda, tanquam unicum objectum totale divinæ prædestinationis, ita ut nihil omnino sit quod subterfugiat illius objecti latitudinem, & quod non cadat sub actu illo prædestinationis.*

4. *Si electorum prædestinatio futura non esset, nihil esset omnino in rerum natura. Itaque statuo tanquam certum, quod nisi Christus futurus esset in mundo, nulla fuisset à Deo facta electorum prædestinatio, non existente autem prædestinatione, ex cujus vi secuta sunt omnia, non esset cœlum, non terra, non reliqua elementa, non viventia, non homines, non Angeli, non peccata, non damones, non reprobi, & demùm, ut uno totum verbo absolvam, solus Deus esset, & nihil aliud esset à Deo, neque naturale neque supernaturale, neque bonum neque malum; loquimur secundum communem rerum legem & ordinem, & juxta eos fines quos probabiliter suspicamur Deum habuisse in creaturarum conditione. Nam nequaquam intendimus divinæ potentiæ majestatem sic nostræ imbecillitatis captui alligare, ut negemus potuisse Deum quæ sua est absoluta potentia, naturam rerum independenter à gratia & gloria, & gratiam independenter à Christo Domino facere & ordinare.*

Then hee proceeds to shew, how many, seeming to favour this opinion of his, yet take quite contrary courses in the maintenance thereof, such as tend rather to the destruction of it; and they are in number five.

Hence hee proceeds to the justification of his owne Tenet: and his first confirmation is derived from that of *Paul*, 1 Cor. 3. 13. *All are yours, and yee are Christs, and Christ is Gods. Ecce ubi* (saith hee) *qua ratione Christus dicitur esse Dei, & prædestinari dicuntur esse ipsius Christi; eadem ratione omnia naturalia, sive præsentia, sive futura, sive vita, sive mors, dicentur esse prædestinatorum: Sed sic est, quod ideò dicitur Christus esse Dei, &*

electi

electi dicuntur esse Christi, quia Deus est finis Christi, & Christus electorum, id est, quia Christus ordinatur in Deum tanquam in finem, & electi in Christum tanquam in finem: & nisi esset ille primus finis, id est, Deus, vel manifestatio gloriæ Dei, non esset Christus; & nisi esset Christus, non essent electi: ergo omnino eadem ratione creaturæ ideò dicuntur esse electorum, quia sunt propter electos, & electi sunt fines earum; & sic nisi essent futuri electi, non essent naturæ creaturarum, &c.

His second proofe is taken from that *Ephes.* 1.4. *Elegit nos in ipso ante mundi constitutionem. Loquitur vero de Christo homine, viz. de Christo capite, ut expresse ibi dicit* Hieronymus, *& ex contextu apertissimè liquet. Certè, aut ego fallor, aut D.* Paulus *non id tantum intendit, quod, viz. nos Deus in Christo elegerit ante veram & realem mundi constitutionem, quæ fuit abhinc sex mille annis in tempore facta. Quod enim nos in Christo elegisset ante illam temporariam rerum creationem, non erit quid magnum & tanto calamo dignum; Sic enim etiam boves & lapides elegit: i. Decrevit & prævidit ante temporariam rerum creationem, quandoquidem priusquam in tempore quidquam faceret, jam illud ante mundi constitutionem & ab æterno excogitaverat ac decreverat ut faceret; aliquid ergo altius & divinius* Paulus *intendit, nempe, quod in sua Deus æternitate cum excogitavit de constituendo mundo, jam prius ordine rationis excogitaverat de electione electorum, jam (inquam) Christum intenderat & præviderat, & in ipso prædestinatos elegerat.*

Other places hee drawes to the same purpose, and concludes with the Argument of *Scot*, which in his judgement is *ratio efficacissima; Omnis ordinatè volens prius vult finem, & ex mediis ea prius quæ sunt fini propinquiora: Sed Christus & prædestinati, ac proinde omnia supernaturalia sunt fini, id est, manifestationi divinæ bonitatis, propinquiora quam omnia naturalia, ergo prius quam naturalia volita sunt à Deo supernaturalia, & his prius manifestatio ipsa divinæ bonitatis, quam consideramus ut horum omnium finem, &c.*

And withall, hee shewes that himselfe is not alone in this opinion, but that the same is maintained by *Jacobus Naclantus*, upon the 1. Ch. of *Eph.* in a digression, *Quo ordine & ratione de rebus definitum fuerit apud Deum.* Albertus Pigh. *lib.* 8. *de lib. Arb. cap.* 3. *& lib.* 1. *in initio.* Ambrosius Catarinus *lib.* 1. *de eximia*

Prædest. Christi. Petrus Galatinus *lib.7. de Arcanis Cathol. veritatis, à cap.3. ad 9.*

But withall, hee obſerves a doubt, the ſolution whereof muſt not bee pretermitted; that is, whether this opinion can be maintained according to the doctrine of *Aquinas*; for, ſaith he, *pag.16. S.* Thomas *exiſtimat, minimè Chriſti prædeſtinationem futuram ſi homo non peecaſſet. Ex quo fieri videtur conſequens, prius viſum à Deo fuiſſe peccatum, & volitam ejus permiſſionem, quam volita fuiſſet incarnatio Verbi: atque adeò non apparet quomodo in via* Thomiſtarum *ſtare poſſit, quod primum omnium decretorum Dei fuerit incarnatio ſeu prædeſtinatio Verbi, ſi jam præceſſit peccati viſio atque permiſſio. Si verò priuſquam peccatum videretur fuit Chriſtus prædeſtinatus, jam ergo etiam non exiſtente peccato, Chriſtus, qui ante viſum peccatum prædeſtinatus fuerat, veniret: Quod directè pugnat cum doctrina S.* Thomæ.

By the way, I obſerve a vaine ſuppoſition to bee the ground of all this perturbation, and conflictation of contrary opinions, in this Argument: And the preſuppoſition is this, That the decree of Chriſts incarnation and of our predeſtination, as alſo of creation, and of the permiſſion of ſinne, cannot bee coordinate and *ſimultanea*, but muſt needs bee ſubordinate and one before another. And ſo hee carrieth himſelfe in the confirmation of the priority of thoſe decrees which hee fancieth to be before the other, as chiefly to oppoſe the priority of the others. And this I account a very vain ſuppoſition, (though, I confeſſe, for many years I was carried away with the common error, and therewithall ſtill found my ſelfe in a brake or labyrinth, without hope of extricating my ſelfe) as I have here proved in part, but elſewhere more at large. But as for the ſolution of the doubt propoſed, his anſwer is this, *Prius Deum voluiſſe unionem hypoſtaticam & incarnationem Verbi, quam vellet permittere peccatum, & quam vellet condere naturam hominis & totius univerſi.* But I have already demonſtrated the falſity of this. But hee proceeds, *Quia tamen non eſt volita incarnatio ſine peccato, imo dependenter eſt volita à permiſſione peccati, & à natura rerum tanquam à mediis; idcireo non ſequitur, futurum eſſe Chriſtum ſi peccatum non eſſet, aut ſi univerſum non eſſet.* Two things he conſtitutes *media tendentia ad incarnationem Chriſti*; and indeed, if the incarnation of Chriſt were firſt in intention, as the end, all other things intended after, muſt bee intended as meanes:

meanes: But I have already shewed how absurdly the creation of mankind is constituted as a meanes of Christs incarnation: and is it not strange, that the making of every worme, or a gnat, should be a meanes tending to the incarnation of Christ? In like sort, I have shewed the absurdity of conceiving the permission of sinne to be a meanes of Christs glorification, much more of his incarnation.

Hee proceeds to remove some other rubs out of the way, but in such a vaine manner, that it were the wasting of time to make relation thereof; neither can I well give account for proceeding so farre as I have done, onely I desired to shew the Authours of this opinion, which here I confute: And I have entertained sometimes a thought of taking occasion to discusse this whole dissertation of *Alphonsus*; but more neceessary businesses have hitherunto taken up my meditations.

And I hope that which I have here delivered may suffice to the cutting off of the very sinewes of that discourse: if not, I shall not be averse from taking further paines, as I shall see cause, and opportunity, and God shall inable me.

Answ. *Much lesse is it my meaning to disparage, or under-value the love of God toward the elect, in that I set forth Christ as not first thought upon by God for the elect sake; for though I doe not preferre his love to us before the love of Christ, yet is the love of God to us unspeakable and glorious; not only in preferring us before the world of other men, and the rest of the creatures, but also in thinking upon us in Christ, upon whom Christ should shew forth the riches of his gracious love and tender mercy.* 1 Tim. 1. 16.

Exam. I confesse, there is no colour of disparaging Gods love to us by giving the precedency of Gods love to Christ, especially when both are acknowledged to be eternall, and to be toward both the man Christ and us, before wee or the world had a being; most of all, when in the issue the priority seems to be for us, rather then for Christ: for it is confest, that priority in Gods decrees consists onely in purposing one thing for another. And again, it is without question, that all priority in this case is on the part of that for which another thing is purposed. Now albeit wee are Christs servants, and hee our Lord; yet, undoubtedly, Christ was ordained rather for our good, then wee for his good: yet I doe not hence collect, that our predestination was before Christs; much lesse, that Gods love

love was lesse towards him then towards us; but I willingly acknowledge, that albeit thousands had tasted of Gods love, both in the way of nature, and grace, and glory, before Christ-man had any being at all; yet was the love of God to the manhood of Christ infinitely beyond his love towards us, measuring the love of God by the effects thereof: and that in two respects; first, for as much as the fruit of Gods love to him was the taking of his humane nature into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God: secondly, in making him the Captain of our salvation, *Heb.* 2.10.

Answ. *Least of all is it my meaning to extenuate the heinous nature of sinne, by setting forth the purpose of God, concerning the incarnation of Christ, before the consideration of the fall of* Adam: *It is enough to make sinne out of measure sinfull, that God in his wisedome saw no meanes so fit, as by the sinne and fall of* Adam, *to make way for the humiliation of Christ, and thereby for the manifestation of his justice, and riches of his mercy, and both in Christ; although we grant, so far as to conceive, that God had never thought of humbling the Godhead, or advancing the manhood of Christ, but upon consideration of sin fore-seen.*

Exam. *Ex magnitudine remedii, magnitudinem cognosce periculi,* saith *Bernard*; this hath place, in what order soever Christ was ordained a Sacrifice for sinne; neither is there any colour of remitting ought of the heinousnesse of sin, by the priority or posteriority of Christs predestination, in comparison to Gods decree, concerning the permission of sinne. Sinne, and the heinousnesse thereof is amplified according to the quality of the transgression, in reference to Gods law, so honourable a rule of mans perfection, and to Gods deserts at our hands, and plentifull motives from consideration both of rewards and punishments, wherewith it is estadlished. It is a common and just aggravation of sinne, that it caused the Son of God to be humbled; but to aggravate it in making way for Christs humiliation, is a very odde conceit, in my judgement. Neither doe I comprehend, how the manifestation of justice in punishing sinne, or of mercy in pardoning it, doth aggravate the heinousnesse of sin; This, I say, I comprehend not.

The

The second Doubt.

WHere have wee, in Scripture, ground for this, That the Lords first and primary intention, in his decree of Predestination, was to set forth Grace and Justice? That the declaration of his justice was intended, is not doubted, but by the Apostle it seemeth, his primary aime was the declaration of the soveraignty, freedom, and dominion of God over the creature, in that hee purposeth grace and power.

Answ. *The Apostle throughout his whole discourse of Predestination, doth no where oppose grace and power; for God sheweth as much power, freedome, and dominion over the creature, in his grace toward the elect, as in his justice toward the world: The Apostle sets forth the like power and soveraign will of God, as well in shewing mercy on whom hee will, as hardening whom hee pleaseth. Doe not think hee opposeth Gods power and soveraignty over* Pharaoh, *to his grace and love unto* Jacob: *for the power hee there speaks of, is not soveraignty, but ability, might, and power, shewing it selfe forth in the hardening and overthrow of* Pharaoh; *in* Moles *called the power of his wrath. Power naturall is one thing, power civill, which wee call soveraignty, another: the first is, ability to doe a thing; the second is, liberty to doe what naturally hee can doe, without sinne. Undoubtedly, the power of God shewed in* Pharaoh, *was in his overthrow, and answerable to the power of Gods wrath.*

Examin. I like well that the power of God shewed in *Pharaoh*, is extended also to the hardening of his heart; onely, this is not so congruously applied to the power of Gods wrath, for as much as wrath hath alwayes reference to something in man, as the cause of it; so hath not hardening: in that of *Paul*, Rom. 9. 18. *Hee hardeneth whom hee will*, like as, *hee hath mercy on whom hee will.* But withall, I confesse, hardening in this place seems to consist onely in denying of mercy: But *Pharaohs* hardening was much more; for, undoubtedly, mercy was no more shewed him when his heart relented to the letting of Israel goe, then when hee detained them. So likewise, when God hardened him to follow after them, to

bring them back, this was more than a bare denying of mercy, even a ſecret impulſion of him to take ſuch courſes as ſhould precipitate him unto deſtruction: and this may well be accounted a fruit of the power of Gods wrath; and accordingly I am verily perſwaded, that Gods power or ſoveraignty over *Pharaoh*, are not oppoſed to his grace and love to *Jacob*: Onely, freedome, in my judgement, doth not ſo well conſent with the execution of juſtice, whether juſtice be taken in rewarding or puniſhing. Neither doe wee ever read of Gods rewarding or puniſhing whom hee will; freedome and ſoveraignty is ſeen only in giving or denying good, according to common account: Albeit, there is a further freedom and ſoveraignty of God, over his creatures, in doing evill unto them; as in annihilating the moſt righteous, which *Arminius* acknowledgeth, and in expoſing his holy Son to ſuffer ſtrange pains and ſorrowes, for other mens ſinnes, when hee had none of his owne. Not to ſpeak of the ſoveraignty wherewith God hath indued man over his fellowes, though inferiour creatures.

Anſw. *That God in his decree of Predeſtination did ſhew forth the declaration of his ſoveraignty, freedome, and dominion over the creatures, I eaſily grant; yet that it was his primary aime, rather then the declaration of his juſtice and grace, I cannot beleeve, without better proofe.*

Examin. My opinion is, That all the variety of Gods glory, to bee manifeſted in the creature, was intended at once; and if they that are otherwiſe minded come to a particular expreſſion of what glory was intended firſt, and what next, and ſo in order, I am perſwaded the incongruity of that order will ſoon appear.

Anſw. *It is granted on all hands, that God firſt aimed at the declaration of his owne glory: Now, wherein doth God delight principally for to manifeſt his glory? God himſelfe declared it to* Moſes, *who deſired him to ſhew him his glory*; The Lord, *ſaith hee*, mercifull, and gracious, and that will by no meanes cleare the guilty, viſiting iniquity: *Where God declareth, and proclaimeth his chiefe glory to ſtand partly of attributes, and the work of grace in the one hand, and of juſtice in the other; for God in like ſort declareth wherein hee delighteth chiefly to glorifie himſelfe, viz. in the exerciſe of loving kindneſſe, and righteouſneſſe, and judgement,* Jer. 9. 24.

Exod. 34. 6, 7.

Examin. I ſhould think whatſoever is in God is equally glorious, even his *ſtrength* as well as his *mercy*, wherewith the Lord begins, in the

the* place alledged, though here pretermitted: Neither doth it follow, that because these only are here mentioned, therefore the glory of God doth principally consist in these. And besides, there is the glory of his soveraignty expressed, even then when the promise of this revelation (here mentioned) was made to *Moses*; to wit, in shewing mercy, and having compassion on whom hee will. *I beseech thee, shew mee thy glory: And hee answered, I will make all my good goe before thee, and I will proclaime the Name of the Lord before thee; for I will shew mercy to whom I will shew mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.* And this is it the Apostle doth most insist upon, *Rom.* 9. yet I make no question but πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, *the various wisdome of God*, is as glorious as any of the rest; and this appeareth in the incarnation of the Sonne of God, and in the complete execution of his office, as in nothing more. But, I conceive, that glory of God represented to *Moses*, *Exod.* 34. 6, 7. was expressed to a speciall end unto his people, namely, to compose them to a greater reverence of his Majesty; which reverence is a quality consisting of a mixture of love and feare, a morall gesture. Not to speak how the execution of mercy and justice are competent unto the creature, nor to mention that wherein *Vasquez* and *Suarez* concurre, otherwise much different, about their conceptions of Gods justice, namely, that there is no justice in God toward the creature which is not grounded upon the determination of his will; and so, undoubtedly, is the execution of his mercy also; onely with this difference, God hath revealed unto us rules, according to which hee will proceed in the execution of his justice; no such rules hath hee revealed to us, or prescribed to himselfe, according to which he wil proceed in the execution of his mercy.

Exod. 34 6. *Exod.* 33. 18, 19.

It is well observed by others, that those vertues which grace the Will, are more honourable than those which grace the Understanding, or other parts: It is a greater honour to a Prince to be gratious and just, then to bee wise and powerfull; power and wisedome may bee found in a vitious Prince, not grace and justice: If then grace and justice doe more set forth the glory of their soveraignty, surely God (who aimeth at his highest glory) in the highest and first place, he aimed chiefly at the manifestation of his grace and justice, above the manifestation of his power and dominion. Answ.

Examin. 1. First concerning the instance it selfe, I answer 1. It is not to be expected, I confesse, that vertue should be found in a vitious person; but yet Princes commonly make more accompt of their absolutenesse, then of their vertue. 2. And the most capitall crime against them, consists rather in the derogation to their power, then to their vertue. 3. And vertue is common to all; and if all were as they ought to be, what glory were it to a King to be vertuous? 2. But as for the accomodation of it, though all were granted, yet it concludes nothing. To be vertuous is honourable to a man, because he is indifferent to execute his power, in the way of vice, as well as in the way of vertue: But there is no such indifferency found in God. Gods gratious disposition tyes him to doe good to none, but to whom he will. Had he never made the world, nor purposed to produce any creature, he had beene notwithstanding the same he now is; yea the very execution of justice in God, doth presuppose the determination of his owne will: whereupon it is that *Bradwardine* distinguisheth betweene *meritum aptitudinale, & meritum actuale. Aptitudinale meritũ* is the merit of such good, as God can bestow in the way of reward, if he will; or such evill as God can inflict in the way of punishment, if he will. *Actuale meritum* is the merit of such good or evill, as God hath determined to bestow, or inflict; Answerable hereunto *Gerson* professeth, that when a sinne is committed, it is meerely at the pleasure of God to inflict what punishment he will. And withall he professeth, that God doth actually remunerate every good worke *ultra condignum*, and punish every evill worke *citra condignum*; all which I hold to be Orthodox, and sound. And let me intreat and prevaile with you, in this, that you will not thinke any thing in the nature of God to be lesse glorious then another, howsoever, to our apprehension, some attributes, may seem more glorious then others.

Answ. *Consider what you finde last in the execution of Gods decree, and from thence gather, what was first in his intention. Now at the last judgement, as likewise in the course of his providence in this world, God doth chiefly manifest the glory of his grace to the elect, and the glory of his justice upon the world. When God in his wayes towards the elect, blesseth them with all spirituall blessings in Christ, what doth he rather aime at, then the praise of the glory of his grace? When God destroyeth the wicked in their flourishing estate,*

eſtate, and cauſeth the righteous to flouriſh, in their weake and decayed age; what doth he rather aime at, then to ſhew that the Lord is upright, and there is noe unrighteouſneſſe with him? When Chriſt ſhall come to judgement at the laſt day, what will he rather ſhew forth, then the righteous judgement of God upon the world of the ungodly, and the admirable glory of his grace to the Saints? Since then, all the wayes of God doe finally worke to this iſſue, the ſetting forth of his grace, and juſtice; ſurely we are ſo to conceive it, as his primary aime and intent to be, to glorifie rather his grace and juſtice, then his power and ſoveraignty.

1. That God doth manifeſt the glory of his grace to the elect, and the glory of his juſtice upon the world, both in this life, and at the day of judgement, I grant; But that he doth chiefly manifeſt this, is not proved: ſave only there is a propenſion in the phraſe, to ſignifie as much, as properly, and then it is true indeed. His grace properly on the one, his juſtice properly on the other; whereas the glory of his power, and ſoveraignty, and wiſdome, is promiſcuouſly ſhewed on both, yet there is not taken ſo diſtinct a conſideration of juſtice, as ſeems fit: For whereas juſtice is as well remunerative, as vindicative; as this hath place only on the wicked, ſo the other on the good; I meane thoſe, that departed the world after they came to yeares of diſcretion: yet conſider, I pray you, what thinke you of them that periſh in no other ſinne but originall, derived unto them by the fall of *Adam*, which *Adam* we beleeve to be ſaved? In the condemnation of theſe what glory of God doth appeare more, either of his juſtice, or of his ſoveraignty? *Examin.*

2. But be it granted, that theſe glories doe appeare chiefly at ſuch times; yet if other glories doe appeare alſo in the ſame laſt execution, how will you deduce herehence, that only thoſe glories you mention were firſt in intention? Will it not rather follow, that ſeeing other glories, as well as theſe, did appeare in execution though not chiefly, therefore other glories, as well as theſe, were firſt in intention, though not chiefly?

3. When God bleſſeth his elect, with all ſpirituall bleſſings in Chriſt, we need not ſay, he aimes rather at ſomewhat elſe then the praiſe of the glory of his grace: when out of meere grace he made his glorious ſelfe known unto us, he made not only his grace known unto us, but all his attributes more or leſſe, which to

our underſtanding are equally glorious in themſelves, though we take more comfort in the ſpeculation of his grace; which yet is more wonderfull, when we conſider his ſoveraignty over us his creatures, and that it was indifferent to him to make us veſſells of wrath, as well as veſſells of mercy: and in this very conſideration, the very damnation of reprobates ſhall improve our glorious joyes in the apprehenſion of Gods free love to us at the day of judgement, according to that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 22. You are to looke to it, how you make your Tenent good, who maintaine that God doth rather aime at the one, then at the other.

4. As for the wicked, the righteouſneſſe of Gods judgement upon them, we can in ſome meaſure conceive at this preſent: But as for the power of God in executing ſuch judgements, maintaining the creature, in the ſuffering of eternall ſorrows, wee are not able to conceive, and therefore the glory hereof is farre more admirable then the other. So likewiſe, what ſhall be the fruits of the grace of God towards us at that day and after, *neither eye hath ſeene, nor eare hath heard, &c.* nor that glory contained in ſeeing the face of God. If God ſhould but reveale unto us the wiſdome whereby he hath managed his providence towards us before he called us, and ſince the calling of us, immediatly by himſelfe, mediatly by the miniſtry of good Angels, contending with, and croſſing the counſells and practiſes of wicked Angels; what a body of glory would appeare unto us, and how ſhould we be raviſhed with the contemplation of it? How much more with the contemplation of his providence thoroughout, both in managing the whole courſe of nature, and the whole courſe of grace?

QUESTION 2.

Queſt. 2. How and by what demonſtrative reaſons, may it appeare that there is a neceſſity of a departing from the doctrine delivered in our Church.

Anſw. *The reaſons, which moved me a little, and but a little to depart from the forme of words uſually received in delivering the doctrine of Reprobation, are ſuch as to me ſeeme, if not demonſtrative, yet convincing. And though I have learned to ſuſpect mine owne judgement where I differ never ſo little from my godly and reve-*

reverend learned Brethren; yet I consider, we are taught to trie all things likewise, and to hold fast that which is good; and as wee believe, so to speake, submitting our selves to the feare of God. But before I come to the ground, whereupon I have beene led to believe, and speake somewhat otherwise of this point, then is commonly received; let me first shew you how farre I consent with the received opinon, even in all usefull truthes; and how little it is then wherin I dissent. In the doctrine of election, I consent wholly with Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Martyr, Zanchy, Perkins, Paræus, *and others, who have taught us, by plaine evidence, and that from scripture:*

1. *That, before the world was, God out of his free will hath chosen the elect by name, by an unchangeable decree, unto grace and glory in Christ Jesus, to the shewing forth of the riches of the glory of his grace.*

2. *That to restore them, who were lost in* Adam, *he sent forth the Lord Jesus, to be obedient to the death for them, and by his death, to redeeme them as effectually, as if they themselves had suffered in their owne persons.*

3. *That in the fulnesse of time, he calleth each one of them, by an effectuall and invincible drawing, even by such an almighty worke of his quickning spirit, as he did put forth in raising Christ from the dead.*

4. *That those, whom he so calleth, he preserveth by some powerfull worke of his spirit to himselfe in Christ, so as they never fall from him totally, or finally: Only herein take it not amisse, if I place the subject of* Election *in Persons considered in Christ, before the world, or themselves were, and not* in massa corrupta, *with the late venerable* Synod. *For though herein they follow* Augustine, *and* Zanchy, *and some others; yet have they dissented from the chiefe instruments, of the reformation of our Religion. And, with reverence I speake it, as I am led to conceive, that it need not trouble any, if, taking Christ to be the head of the elect, I conceive him to be first thought upon, and chosen, and we in him. Mr.* Baynes, *followeth the schoole in so expressing it; and the reasons delivered above in the first point, have carryed me with them: and the difference lyeth in opening the purpose of Reprobation. But see here how farre I goe with the streame, and, then I goe aside, how little, and upon what ground.*

How

Examin. How convincing, or demonstrative, the reasons are, I addresse my selfe to consider: It is good to make progresse in the investigation of truth. *Austin* professeth himselfe to be of the number of those *qui proficiendo scribunt, & scribendo proficiunt*: only our care must be, that we goe not backward, and make things worse then wee found them; which comes to passe (especially with good men) many times, not so much by falling into error, as by confusion of method; for hereby it comes to passe, that the passages opening the way to the investigation of truth, are stopt up, and we find our selves in a brake, and see no way out. To prevent them, I am perswaded, it is a profitable consideration, to thinke with our selves, that different opinions, especially amongst godly Divines, may be no other then the dividing of the truth betweene them.

About the object of predestination there hath bin a triple difference in opinion: some standing for *massa nondum condita*; others for *massa pura*, that is *condita* but *nondum corrupta*; others for *massa corrupta*: yet both *Junius* did endeavour: but very obscurely; and *Piscator* hath endeavoured very perspicuously to reduce them into one. If he failed therein, especially in some one particular, his failing, rightly observed and discerned, may open a way for the discovery of the entire truth. But let the issue therof commend it selfe. Your phrase of usefull truths I do not like; amongst *Arminians*, I often meet with such a course of arguing truth, by the usefulnesse of it; which is like the giving of the larger coat to him that is bigger, because it is fitter for him, when in the mean time he had no right unto it.

And though we can judge aright of a coats fitnesse to a body; yet it is a dangerous course for us, to presume so farre of our judgements in the usefulnesse of opinions, as thereupon to conclude what are true, and what are false.

1. To choose before the world, is to choose before the creation, or *Adams* fall, according to your owne exposition, formerly mentioned: but in this sense, your selfe confesseth in the 4. place, that *Austin* and *Zanchy* doe not concurre with others in this; was there no more in Gods intention, when he elected some, then the manifestation of the riches of his glorious grace? Did not God purpose to manifest also the glory of his remunerative justice? Is it not undeniable, that God will bestow salvation upon all his elect

elect (of ripe yeares, before their departure out of this world) by way of reward, and crowne of righteousnesse, which God the righteous Judge shall give at that day to all that love his Sonnes appearing? It being a righteous thing with God, to recompence tribulation to them that trouble his Children; so to his Children that are troubled, rest with his Apostles: *when the Lord Jesus shall shew himselfe from Heaven, with his mighty Angels, in flaming fire, rendring vengance &c. When he shall come to be glorified in his Saints, and be made marvellous, in all them that beleeve &c.* It is great pity this is not considered (as usually it is not) especially for the momentous consequence thereof, in my judgement, sufficient (if I mistake not) to have stifled this opinion following, touching Reprobation, in the first conception of it. 2 Tim 4. 2 Thessa. 1.

2. Touching the Second, I have nothing to say; for if you have any opinion concerning some benefit that redounds to the Reprobate by the death of Christ, it is more then hitherunto you do discover.

3. Touching the Third, it were to be desired you did expresse, whether no lesse powerfull motion, would serve to the drawing of them to faith and repentance.

4. Likewise touching the Fourth, whether this powerfull worke being denyed to any, it is possible for such a one to beleeve, and repent unto salvation. Concerning the order here mentioned, though my opinion be, that the object of predestination is *massa nondum condita*, yet in no moment of nature, or reason, was the decree of God concerning Christs incarnation, and our salvation by him, before the decree of creation, and of permission of *Adams* fall, and consequently Election unto Salvation had the consideration of *massa corrupta* concomitant with it, though not precedent; only the consideration of *massa nondum condita* being antecedentall to all these decrees. Likewise, in my opinion, they doe mistake, who take the Synod of *Dort* to maintaine the consideration of *massa corrupta*, as precedent to Election, though they beginne with signifying what God purposed to bring to passe, upon the fall of mankind, in *Adam*. And *Calvin* in his answere to *Pighius* confesseth, that the safest course is to create of predestination, upon the consideration of the corrupt masse in *Adam*. As touching what you have delivered, touching Election in Christ our head, in the first place, that I have already examined.

Our Divines commonly conceive, a double act of Reprobation, Answ.

as Bellarmine, and others of the Papists doe.

1. Negative, as they call it, a non-election, or Reprobation, unto which some adde a purpose of forsaking the creature, excluding it from glory, and from sufficient meanes of grace in Christ.

2. Positive, ordaining it to condemnation.

The former, they conceive to be absolute, as being an act of Gods soveraigne Lordship over the creature, without all respect to sinne.

The latter they conceive, as being an act of vindicative justice, to presuppose originall sinne at the least, and some of them (as Bellarmine) actuall sinne also, whom Paraus in this point seemeth to give way unto.

1. To the first of these acts I wholly assent so farre as it resteth in a non-election, or preterition of the creature, according to the libertie of Gods absolute soveraignetie. That which is added to it, of a purpose of forsaking the creature, and to exclude it from glory, and from sufficient meanes of grace in Christ, before all respect of sinne, I want warrant from scripture to condescend unto. But this Negative act, I would rather expresse in such words as the holy Ghost hath used before me, and so distinguish it into two branches.

1. That before all respect of good or evill in the creature:

1. God did not so love the world, (I meane the world of mankind distinguished from the elect:) this is plaine from the Apostles comparison of Jacob and Esau. Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13.

2. God did not give the world to Christ, by him of grace to be brought to salvation, as he did the elect, for they are not said to be written in the Lambs book of life from the beginning of the world. Revel. 13. 8, 17, 18. And indeed all who were given to Christ, or, in fulnesse of time, come unto him. Joh. 6. 37.

3. Gods hatred of Esau before he had done good or evill, reacheth to this act also. Rom. 9. 13.

2. Touching the positive act, which they conceive, I wholly agree with them, that God ordaineth none to condemnation, but upon sinne presupposed. Annihilate the creature God may without presupposall of sinne; for annihilation is an act of Soveraignetie, suteable to creation; but condemne it he may not, without presupposall of sinne. For condemnation is an act of justice, and presupposeth a rule of justice transgressed, and thereby wrath, or just re-

venge

venge provoked, onely this positive act of Gods counsell about the world of mankind severed from the elect, upon serious consideration of sundry passages of Scripture, I would rather distinguish into a double act.

1. Whereby, without all respect of good or evill in the men of this world, God ordained them unto judgment, according to their works. Ezech. 33. 20. *to judgment, I say, not of condemnation, which presupposeth sinne in the creature to be condemned; but judgment (I meane) of just retribution, whereby God is willing to deale with them, according to their works in justice; justice I say, aswell distributive, to reward them with life, if they continue in obedience; as vindicative, to punish them to death, if they provoke him by carelesse and wilfull disobedience.*

Hitherto, even to this act, the hatred of God to Esau *reached.*

2. Whereby, upon the presupposall of the carelesse or wilfull disobedience of the world, either in refusing the meanes of grace in Christ, or abusing other talents and helps of the knowledge of God in nature, God rejecteth, or reprobateth them from all hope of life, and purposeth to condemne them for their sinnes, to the glorifying of his power, justice and wrath.

Non-election, absolute is an act of soveraignitie, you grant; which also you call preterition. Let us speake distinctly, that the fairer way may bee opened, to the discovery of truth and error. Preterition may be in time; as when, in giving grace to some, God passeth by others: or it may have place as well in not purposing to give grace to some, when he doth purpose to give grace to others, which purpose of his was from everlasting; and preterition in this sense, is all one with non-election. Now this non-election is either a negation of election unto grace, or a negation of election unto glory; It is here proposed indefinitely, and I conceive it is understood of both. Now it is true, that *Iohn Scot*, and *Francis Mayro* after him, did sometimes shape the order of Gods decrees in this manner: In the first instant of nature, *Peter* and *Judas* being offered to the divine consideration, *Deus volebat* Petro *gloriam, nihil volebat* Judæ; in the second instant, *Deus volebat* Petro *gratiam, nihil volebat* Judæ; In the third instant, *Deus volebat utrũque existere in massa corrupta*; wherehence it followeth in the last place, (sayeth hee) that the one shall infallibly be saved, the other damned. This sometimes seemed plausible to me, and I did pre- *Examin.*

ferre it, and still doe, before the perverse orders of Gods decrees, devised by many. For, *est quiddam prodire tenus*: we have the shorter way to our jorneys end. But in what instant shall God *velle* Judæ *damnationem*? not till after all this? If it be last in intention, shall it not be first in execution, according to your owne rules, so much insisted on in the first place? The *Dominicans* and particularly *Alvarez* professeth in opposition to these negative decrees of *Scotus*, that the decree of reprobation is positive; and one reason amongst others is this, because if reprobation were meerly negative, then all men and Angels possible, though never existent, might be justly said to be reprobate as well as the reprobate men and Angels that are or shall be existent. For it is most true, that they are *non electi*, in as much as one of contradictions is verified *de omni ente, & non ente*; therefore certainly there goes more to reprobation then a meere negation of election. And, in my judgment, this reason of his is a weighty reason. Therefore they professe plainly, that God did not only *not purpose* to give *Judas* glory, but he did purpose to deny him glory, that is, ordaine that he should be without glory: Secondly, that he did not only not purpose to give him grace, but also did purpose to deny him grace, or ordaine, that he should be without grace, at least without such grace as should bring him to salvation. And indeed if God doth purpose that *Judas* shall exist in the corrupt masse, and withall doth not purpose to give him grace and glory, doth it not manifestly follow, that he shall exist without grace and glory? for how shall he come by glory or grace, if not from God? Or how shall God deny him one or other, but according to the Counsell of his will, seeing he workes all things according to the counsell of his will? Therefore God did not only not purpose that he should have grace and glory, but did positively purpose that he should be without both: and it is *Bradwardins* opinion, that no pure negative act can be attributed unto God, but such as is æquivalently resolved into an act positive, thus, If *Deus non volebat gloriam Judæ*, then *Deus volebat illi non gloriam*; that is, that he should not have glory: so of grace, so of existencie; if God did not will the existency of more Angels then are; it followes that God did will that more Angels then are should not exist; and that this positive act doth better become the nature of God, then the former negative, by reason of his most perfect actuality. And as

for

for the purpose of forsaking the creature, and excluding it from glory; that is no other then Gods purpose not to give certaine creatures any such grace, as whereby they shall be brought to glory. And seeing this is acknowledged by you, I see no cause why you should stick in acknowledging a purpose of God to forsake some creatures, and exclude them from glory. It is plea, that the prejudice of phrases, whereby it is expressed, should strangle any doctrine, when there lyes no just exception against it, as untrue in the substance thereof. When you confesse, that God did not so love the world, as the elect (which is no more, then to acknowledge a non-election of some) if you expound it in reference unto his purpose of not giving grace and glory unto them, as to the elect; *Aquinas* himselfe acknowledgeth, that *odisse* in Scripture phrase is no other then *non velle alicui gratiam & gloriam*. And it is well knowne that Mr. *Perkins* doth as eagerly oppose this absolute reprobation negative, as absolute reprobation positive: For he manifestly perceives, that damnation follows as infallibly, and unavoidably upon that doctrine of reprobation negative, as upon this of reprobation positive.

If you conceive, that God did give the world to Christ, by him of grace to be bought to some kind of grace, though not to salvation, as he did the elect; I doubt you are not able to bring any sufficient reason to justifie this; whereupon it will follow, that Christs death was meritorius unto them, but not satisfactorie; or if satisfactorie, yet onely for some sinnes of theirs, but not for all.

As touching the act positive of reprobation, I trust when all things are rightly stated, there will appeare to be as little reason, why there should be any difference between us in this act, as in the former. For what, I pray, is the meaning of this, *God ordaines none to condemnation, but upon some presupposed*? Is there any other meaning of the words then this; God hath ordained that no man shall be condemned, but for sinne? who ever denyed this? What one of our Divines, or Papists, or of any Sect, ever called this into question? But hereupon it only followes, that sinne is the cause of condemnation, and that by the ordination of God: it follows not, that sin is the cause of Gods ordination; although I confesse the confusion of these is most frequent amongst our Divines, amongst Papists, though otherwise very learned, and chiefly among the *Arminians*, for the advantage of their cause;

yet see not a farre greater advantage to their cause then any yet hath been taken hold of by any one of them: And this confusion alone is that which sets our Divines together by the eares, not considering the dangerous consequence here-hence, utterly overthrowing the Orthodox doctrine of our Churches, in the very point of Election, and bringing in *Arminianisme* entire and whole; not in Reprobation only, as Master *Moulin* doth, and you seeme to doe; but in Election it selfe unavoidably, though hitherto, I confesse, the *Arminians* have not been so happy as to discerne it. I doubt not but your meaning is, in that Proposition, That sinne is not only the cause of damnation, but of Gods decree also of ordaining thereunto. But to affirme this, seemed so foule to *Aquinas*, (namely, that there should be conceived a cause of Gods will, or Gods decree) that hee professeth, never any man was so madde as to affirme it. But because the saying of *Aquinas* moves you little; why should it, seeing it little hindered not onely *Valentianus* the Jesuite from saying as you doe, but *Alvarez* also the *Thomist*, and a great *Thomist*? therefore I will proceed further: What should move you to affirme, That, to ordaine to condemnation is an act of vindicative justice? Condemnation, I grant, is an act of vindicative justice, like as remuneration is an act of justice remunerative; but will it follow here-hence, that to ordaine to condemnation is an act of vindicative justice? I will not presse you with the authority of Master *Baynes*, who denyes Reprobation to be an act of justice; but thus I dispute: If Gods purpose to condemne to death, be an act of justice vindicative; then also Gods purpose to remunerate with eternall life, is an act of justice remunerative: And if Gods purpose of condemnation presuppose sinne, it followes, that Gods purpose of remunerating with eternall life must also presuppose obedience; even obedience of faith, repentance, and good works; for all these God doth remunerate with eternall life. Here appeareth the foule tayle of *Arminianisme*, in the doctrine of Election, which this plausible doctrine of yours and of Master *Moulins*, in the point of Reprobation, drawes after it. The consequence is manifest, though few or none consider it, even of them that are both Orthodox in Election, and most versed in the examining and discerning of just consequences. Now because this consequence, I presume, is unexpected, I imagine men may bee moved to cast about, and consider how they may wind themselves

out

out of this dangerous inconvenience. And perhaps it may come to their mindes to affirme, that they doe not conceive Election under this forme; namely, to bee the decree of God to remunerate with everlasting life. And I verily believe they doe not; for if they did, it were not possible they should continue Orthodox in the point of Election; but miserably betray their cause, by giving way to a doctrine (plainly contradictory) in the point of Reprobation. But why then doe they not consider Election as they ought? Is it not generally confessed, that Election and Reprobation are contrary? why then should they not be shapen under contrarient formes? and what act, I pray you, is contrary to the act of justice vindicative, but the act of justice remunerative? But perhaps you may say, Though this bee true, yet there is no place for such an opposition here; for as much as though a man may merit damnation by sinne, yet hee cannot merit salvation by obedience? I answer therefore, that this onely shewes there can be no opposition between them in a speciall kind of retribution, to wit, in the way of retribution according to desert on both sides; yet this hinders not, but that there may be, and indeed is, an opposition in the generall of retribution: For it is well knowne, that God will reward every one according to his works; and that he means to bestow salvation upon every one of ripe yeares by way of reward, and, *tanquam coronam justitiæ*, as the *Arminians* urge; and justly, though with no just advantage to their cause, but according to their shallow and unlearned conceits; as if therefore God should first fore-see their obedience, before hee should ordaine them to a reward: which yet will follow, if on the other side wee grant them, that God first fore-seeth mans finall impenitency, and thereupon ordaines them to condemnation. Perhaps you may say, Is not the contrariety between Election and Reprobation sufficiently maintained, by saying, the one is Gods purpose ordaining to salvation; the other Gods purpose ordaining to condemnation? I confesse, it seemes so, and is generally reputed to be so: and this I take to bee the principall cause of this error; one confusion drawing on more and more after it. But, I say, there is no congruous opposition between salvation and damnation; for, to damne is either finally to punish, or to adjudge to punishment. Now, as the Negative opposition hereunto is onely not to punish, or to adjudge to punishment; so the contrary opposition hereunto

unto is to reward, or to adjudge to a reward; So that Election, as it is Gods purpose ordaining to salvation, by way of reward, is onely opposite contrarily to Reprobation, as it signifies Gods purpose ordaining to condemnation. More fairly, and voyd of all equivocation, thus: Like as Reprobation is Gods purpose to punish with everlasting death; so Election is Gods purpose to remunerate with everlasting life. And thus the contrariety of these acts being rightly stated, it followes as evidently, that Election must presuppose, not obedience, but the fore-sight of obedience; as Reprobation presupposeth not sinne, but the fore-sight of sin. And thus are wee tumbled into the very gulfe of *Arminianisme*, over head and eares, before wee are aware. But it may bee this discourse of mine may raise such a Spirit as will not easily bee laid; and hereupon some may the more profusely bee carryed to embrace *Arminianisme*, in the very point of Election also; because, as Reprobation seemes to bee an act of justice vindicative; so Election also, as here it is stated, seemes to bee an act of justice remunerative. And I willingly confesse, I never found any *Arminian* that discernes the advantage which our Divines doe afford them, by shaping the doctrine of Reprobation as they doe: Therefore I will endeavour to quiet this Spirit that I have raised, first, by discovering the Sophistry that bleares our eyes in this; and secondly, by cleare demonstration I will prove, that no fore-sight of sinne and obedience can precede the purpose of God ordaining to salvation and damnation. As for the discovering of the Sophistry which hath place herein, consider; first, It is agreed between *Vasquez* and *Suarez* (though otherwise much at odds about the nature of justice in God) that there is no justice in God towards his creature, but upon the presupposition of his will: whence it followeth manifestly, that the purposes of God, being the very acts of his will, are no acts of justice, but onely the executions of these purposes may bee acts of justice; to wit, upon the presupposition of some act or purpose of his will. And the reason hereof (not to insist wholly upon any humane authority) is manifest, for as much as in remunerating it is cleare, that God is not bound to remunerate any creature, but upon presupposition of his will; for hee may convert him into nothing, if it please him: But if hee hath determined to reward them according to their obedience, it must needs bee so; for as much as the Divine nature is without variablenesse

neſſe or ſhadow of change. So likewiſe, neither is God bound to puniſh any ſinner; for hee may pardon him, if it pleaſe him; but upon ſuppoſition that hee hath determined not to leave a ſinner unpuniſhed: in this caſe onely is hee bound to puniſh. Further, I will ſhew, that in ſuch acts, the condition whereof doth not depend upon the will of God, the act may be of one condition, and yet nevertheleſſe the purpoſe of God to performe ſuch an act is of another condition: As for example; the act of creation is an act of Gods almighty power; but Gods purpoſe to create the world is no act of power, but of will rather. So likewiſe, Gods act of ordering all things unto their end, in wonderfull manner, is an act of infinite wiſedome; but his purpoſe to order all things, in ſo admirable manner, is no act of his wiſedome, but of his free-will. Now I will demonſtrate, that the fore-ſight of ſinne cannot be the cauſe of Gods purpoſe to condemne: For if it be the cauſe of Gods purpoſe; then either by neceſſity of nature, or by the free conſtitution of God: not by neceſſity of nature; for hee is naturally more prone (as *Piſcator* confeſſeth upon *Exod.* 24. 6.) to remunerate obedience, than to puniſh for ſinne: but no man will ſay, that hee doth remunerate by neceſſity of nature; therefore neither doth hee puniſh ſinne by neceſſity of nature: therefore it muſt be onely through the voluntary conſtitution of God, that ſinne is the cauſe of ordination unto condemnation. But marke, I pray, the foule abſurdity hereof; for here-hence it followes, that God did purpoſe that upon the fore-ſight of ſinne hee would purpoſe that men ſhould be damned. So that the purpoſe of God is made the object of his purpoſe; and that upon a certaine condition: whereas nothing can be the object of Gods purpoſe, but ſome temporall thing or other; and conſequently, one purpoſe of God ſhall be in time precedaneous to another purpoſe of God; which is impoſſible: firſt, becauſe no purpoſe of God begins in time: ſecondly, there is no priority between the purpoſes of God, but priority of nature and reaſon; and that onely in ſuch a caſe as when one is of the end, and the other of the meanes tending to that end; which hath no place in this matter wee now treat of. By the way, when you ſay, God cannot condemne the creature without ſinne, though hee may annihilate him; what doe you meane by condemnation? doe you take it for puniſhment? If ſo, then the formality of it, expreſſed at full, is this; Affliction for ſinne. Now

consider, is it a sober speech to say, God cannot afflict for sin, without the presuppose all of sinne? I doubt not but you deliver your mind, of what God cannot do in the way of justice: But it is utterly impossible that any man should bee afflicted for sinne without the presuppose all of sin: I presume your meaning is only this, (though incommodiously expressed) God cannot excruciate or afflict a creature without the presuppose all of sinne. But in whom? I doubt not but your meaning is, in the person afflicted. But what thinke you then of the Sonne of God, how was hee afflicted, and without any presuppose all of sinne in him? And I pray you tell mee, hath not God as much power over us as over him? Againe, consider I pray, what power doth God give unto man over inferiour creatures? But let this passe: Can God annihilate us without any respect to sinne, and can hee not afflict us? Alas! what affliction would most men bee content to endure rather then to dye, much more rather then to bee turned to the gulfe of nothing, from whence wee came? If it be said, that God may afflict in some degree, but not in the highest; or for a time, but not for ever; such as wee conceive that torment to bee which wee signifie by the word Condemnation: I pray remember, wee are made after the image of God, and endued with the light of reason, and let us not cast our selves in a brutish manner upon conceits without all evidence of reason. Now tell mee, what reason can bee devised why God should bee able, without all prejudice of his justice, to inflict paine in one degree, in two degrees, in three or foure degrees, in five, six, and seven degrees, without all respect to sinne, onely, if in the eight degree hee should inflict it in this manner, he should bee unjust? Againe, if without injustice hee may inflict paine on an innocent creature for a thousand yeares, or ten thousand yeares, or ten times ten thousand, what reason why hee cannot afflict a creature for ever, without injustice? yet if no finite time can be set which hee cannot exceed, why not for ever? Nay, if a creature should be put to his choyce, whether he would choose to bee annihilated, or to bee in eternall torment, yet preserved without sinne, which of these two would an holy creature make choyce of? should he not preferre his being without sinne (though in eternall torment) before annihilation?

But let us consider the double act of God here devised about the world of mankind severed from the elect: God, you say, did ordain

ordaine to judge them according to their workes. I pray consider, who denyeth this? even they that maintaine Reprobation as absolute as Election, doe notwithstanding maintaine, that God doth judge them no otherwise then according to their works; for they doe not avouch that God doth ordaine to damne them for ought else then for sinne; yea and that for sinne actuall, as many as doe dye in actuall sin unrepented of; and for originall sinne, as many as doe dye only in originall sinne. Againe, will you deny the same forme of decree to have his course concerning the elect, as well as concerning the Reprobate? Doth not God reward them according to their workes? I meane, as many as live unto ripenesse of age; for otherwise it cannot be verified of the Reprobates. And if God doth reward the righteous according to their workes, did hee not also ordaine from everlasting so to reward them? Neither is Election, rightly stated and incongruous opposition unto Reprobation, any other then Gods decree to reward men with everlasting life for their obedience of faith, repentance, and good works; like as Reprobation is Gods decree to punish them with everlasting death, for their continuance in sinne, without repentance, unto death; albeit, neither of these is Gods complete decree, on either side: but the decree of Election, is, *Preparatio gratiæ & gloriæ*, as *Austin* saith; that is, a decree to give both the grace of obedience, both in the way of faith, repentance, and good works, and to crowne them with everlasting life for it. And so on the other side, *Reprobatio*, as *Aquinas* speaketh, *includit voluntatem permittendi peccatum, & damnationem inferendi pro peccato*: It is the purpose of God both to deny the grace of obedience, as afore-said; or, which is all one, to permit them to persevere in sinne and finall impenitency, and to inflict damnation for their sinne. And unlesse Election on the one side, and Reprobation on the other, doe include the parts before mentioned, wee shall fall into the *Arminians* definition of Election and Reprobation, who make them meerly conditionate, either in formall terms, or though they avoid the formality of such expressions, yet meerly in effect: as by saying, that, Election is Gods purpose to save them that beleeve and repent; Reprobation Gods purpose to damne them that doe not beleeve and repent: as if there were no other purpose of God, revealed in Gods word, then these; no decree of shewing mercy to whom hee will, by giving faith and repentance; no

decree of hardening whom hee will, by denying it. Againe, when I say, God doth purpose to reward every man according to his workes, let us understand it aright; for indeed there neither is, nor can bee any such formall decree of God, and of an indefinite nature: as if God in priority of nature or reason did make such a decree, not knowing as yet what would bee the workes of each man in particular; for of such a decree there can be no correspondent execution, distinct from the execution of particular and definite decrees, concerning all men in particular, as I have already shewed in ransacking the absurd order of Gods decrees devised by *Arminians*, to no other end but to catch the simple; there being no common sense nor sobriety in them throughout. Besides this, if when God is conceived to make such a decree God did know particularly the workes of all, then there is no reason to conceive that hee made any such indefinite decree; but rather that the decree to save or damne every one in particular according to his workes, well knowne to him in that very instant, not of duration only, but of nature and reason. But God did in the same moment foreknow all the particular workes of every man, as already I have made manifest, in ransacking the *Arminian* order of Gods decrees. But the denomination of such an indefinite decree, as to reward every man according to his workes, ariseth from the consideration of other definite decrees in God: As for example, God did decree to have mercy on *Peter*, in giving him faith and repentance, and accordingly to save him; and so of every one of Gods Elect, of ripe yeares: On the contrary, God did decree to deny to *Judas* the grace of faith and repentance, which is as much as to say, that God decreed to permit him to continue finally in sinne, and accordingly to damne him; and so every one of the Reprobates: Whence it followeth, that it is true to affirme, that God decreed to reward every one of ripe yeares according to their workes; not that there ever was any such particular decree conceived by God, distinct from the former, as the *Arminians* feigne; but that from the former particular decrees resulteth the denomination of such a decree as this; as if you should say, If God did decree to save *Peter* and *Paul*, it followeth, that God did decree to save some: not that God did first indefinitely decree to save some, and then finding that *Peter* and *Paul* should be two of them. And to reward men according to their workes, is no more a worke of

Vindiciæ gratiæ Dei. lib. 3. dig. 2.

hatred

hatred then of love; but as it is indefinite, ſo it is indifferent to prove in the iſſue either a worke of hatred or of love; as that God, *Who worketh in us every thing that is pleaſing in his ſight through Jeſus Chriſt*, Heb. 13. 21. ſhall worke in ſome that which is pleaſing in his ſight through Jeſus Chriſt, and not in others.

Neither will it follow here-hence, that God rejecteth and reprobateth ſome upon preſuppoſall of diſobedience, more then that hee electeth and predeſtinateth others upon preſuppoſall of their obedience; for undoubtedly God purpoſed as well to reward the godly according to their workes, as the ungodly according to theirs; though, I confeſſe, there is a great difference betweene the condition of evill workes and good workes; evill workes being meritorious of puniſhment, good workes no way meritorious of reward: but this nothing hinders the courſe of remuneration in generall: And againe, what is wanting of merit on the part of Gods Elect, is abundantly ſupplyed by the merit and ſatisfaction of Chriſt. It followeth, I confeſſe, that upon diſobedience on the one ſide (provided it be finall, not otherwiſe; for, undoubtedly, abuſe both of means of grace in Chriſt, and other talents and helps of the knowledge of God in nature, is found alſo in the Elect, though not finall; for, *Novimus*, ſaith *Auſtin*, that God hath converted *non modo averſas à vera fide, ſed & adverſas veræ fidei voluntates*) God damneth ſome for diſobedience; and it is no leſſe true, that upon obedience on the other ſide, God ſaves the others. But this opinion, I confeſſe, was heretofore ſhaped by Doctor *Overall*, and perhaps taken from *Caterinus*, but with a little variation, and, if I be not deceived, firſt deviſed by the Author of the two bookes, *De vocatione Gentium*; all which notwithſtanding are orthodox in the point of Election throughout, excepting *Caterinus*, whoſe orthodoxy therein is onely in part. But, in few words, I will diſprove this latter poſition of yours, by your owne rules: For thus I diſpute, If God did firſt fore-ſee mans diſobedience, and then ordaine them to condemnation, then God did firſt decree to permit this diſobedience, before hee did decree to damne them for it. Whence it followeth, that the permiſſion of this ſinne was firſt in intention, and conſequently, laſt in execution: that is, God muſt firſt damne them, and afterwards permit their diſobedience, whereby they deſerve damnation. Yet,

I pray, conceive not hereupon that I maintaine, that God doth firſt purpoſe to damne men, and ſecondly purpoſe to permit their diſobedience; both orders, in my opinion, are very diſſolute; though I confeſſe it is commonly ſo received, that by denying the one wee muſt neceſſarily fall upon the other.

Anſw. *Herein two things are granted by common conſent of our Divines:*

1. *That the end of Gods purpoſe in his poſitive Reprobation of the world, is to glorifie his juſtice, power, and wrath in their juſt overthrow and condemnation.*

2. *That hee doth not purpoſe to condemne them but for ſinne.*

But two other things you ſee there bee, wherein, I confeſſe, I diſſent from them; but with ſubmiſſion of my ſpirit to the guidance of the word, and the ſpirit of my brethren.

1. *In the firſt act of poſitive Reprobation, that I doe not acknowledge any unwillingneſſe at all in God to reward the men of this world with life, upon any condition whatſoever.*

2. *In the ſecond act of poſitive Reprobation, that I doe conceive the decree of Reprobation to be converſant about the world, not as conſidered* in maſſa primitus corrupta, *as in the firſt fall of* Adam; *but as afterwards voluntarily falling from the meanes, either of grace in the ſecond* Adam, *or of the knowledge of God in nature, by ſome acts of careleſſe or wilfull diſobedience.*

Examin. Theſe two things above mentioned are granted not onely by the common conſent of our Divines, but by the common conſent alſo of all Chriſtians, as I conceive, whether Papiſts or *Arminians*: yet obſerve, I pray, as touching the ſecond, that ſinne is apparently made the cauſe onely of condemnation, but not of Gods purpoſe; whereas hitherto you have carryed the matter ſo, as if ſinne were the cauſe not onely of condemnation, but alſo of Reprobation; as much as to ſay, of Gods purpoſe to condemne. But to ſay, that God for ſinne did purpoſe to condemne for ſin, is ſo harſh an expreſſion, that in all my reading I never found any adventure thereupon. Come wee to your proper opinion: You doe not acknowledge any *unwillingneſſe in God to reward the men of this world with life, upon any condition whatſoever.* I know no reaſon why you ſhould conceive any of our Divines to differ from you in this, although you had ſpoken out your meaning never ſo plainly and fully: not onely denying unwillingneſſe, but acknowledging

acknowledging a willingneſſe, as afterwards you doe; nor a willingneſſe onely which may have place though joyned with a will to the contrary, as in all mixt actions, which yet are not incident to God, though they are to a creature, as who ſometimes doth ſome thing *volens nolens*: for certainly, God will ſave any man upon condition hee beleeves and repents: And on the other ſide, neither is there any unwillingneſſe in God, but a willingneſſe rather, yea and that a reſolute will to damne any man in caſe hee dyeth in infidelity and impenitency. For we have the cleare word of God to juſtifie us herein, profeſſing moſt evidently, that, *Whoſoever beleeveth ſhall be ſaved; whoſoever beleeveth not ſhall be damned.* So that I wonder not a little whereto theſe expreſſions tend, ſave that commonly, ſuch is the iſſue of imperfect conceptions, all preparations to the juſtifying of them fall miſerably ſhort of that whereunto they aime.

2. As touching the ſecond act, either you muſt profeſſe that no Infants periſh in originall ſinne; or you muſt, according to your Tenet, conſider them onely *in maſſa primitus corrupta*; for as much as they, dying before they came to the uſe of reaſon, were never guilty of any voluntary falling off from the meanes, either of grace in the ſecond *Adam*, or of the knowledge of God in nature, by ſome acts of careleſſe or wilfull diſobedience. As for their opinion, who thinke the conſideration of all men *in maſſa Ade* ſufficient to juſtifie God in decreeing the condemnation of all, I take it to be a very rude and undigeſted conceit; for undoubtedly, if the conſideration of ſinne be at all prerequired to the decree of condemnation, it muſt bee the conſideration rather of that ſinne for which they are chiefly damned: For, ſhall the conſideration of that ſinne onely, which deſerves the leaſt degree of damnation, juſtifie God in the decreeing the greateſt degree of condemnation? what colour of juſtice is found in this? Shall the conſideration of telling an officious lye, juſtifie a Magiſtrate in decreeing to inflict ſuch a puniſhment as is due onely to high treaſon? I ſay rather, that God conſiders none *in maſſa Ade*, before they are *in maſſa Ade*; for thus to conſider, is not *conſiderare*, but *errare*, or *fingere*; which wee cannot decently attribute to God: but God conſidered all men *tanquam in maſſa Ade futuros*; and as many as ſhould dye in infancy, God conſidered them in no other ſtate of ſinne, *tanquam futuros*, but in

that.

that. As for as many as should survive to the use of reason, God considered them, *tanquam futuros*, not onely *in massa Adæ*, but guilty of their owne personall transgressions; and whom hee so considered, and withall as finally persevering therein, all them hee decreed to damne. So likewise whom hee considered *tanquam fideles futuros, & resipiscentiam acturos, & in fide & resipiscentia perseveraturos*, hee decreed to save. But take heed that herehence you inferre not, Therefore fore-sight of perseverance in sin was the cause or prerequisite of Reprobation; lest you be driven by just proportion to confesse, that fore-sight of faith also and perseverance therein was the cause, or prerequisite at least, of Election. Yet doe not hereupon fall into the contrary extreme, as to thinke that then the decree of Salvation and Damnation precedes the foresight of faith on the one side, or of finall impenitency on the other; though such delusions have had their course, and passed in the world a long time; and all for want of a little Logick, in discerning the right order in intention of the meanes tending to a certaine end: For, both creation and permission of sinne in *Adam*, and finall perseverance in sinne, and damnation for sinne, are but joynt meanes tending to one end; to wit, the glory of God, in the way of justice vindicative: and consequently the intention of all those meanes is at once, neither before nor after other, howsoever they are not at once in execution, (which perhaps is the rock of offence whereat many stumble ere they are aware:) As for example, To the curing of a disease a Physician discerneth that many operations are necessarily requisite, these are at once intended, the nature of the disease bespeaking them all; but they are not, nor cannot be executed at once: The like may bee said of all other proceedings, according to the order of *medii* and *finis*. So on the other side, creation, permission of sin, deliverance from sinne by the grace of faith and repentance, and finally salvation, are all but joynt meanes tending to one and the same end; to wit, the glory of God in the way of mercy mixt with justice; and consequently, all at once in intention, though not all at once in execution. But to disprove that which here you affirme, as if some wilfull disobedience, in Gods fore-sight, was before the decree of condemnation, I dispute thus, according to your owne rules; If the fore-sight of disobedience did precede the decree of condemnation, then God did first decree to permit

this

this disobedience, before hee did decree to damne any man for it: which is as much as to say, Mans disobedience was first in Gods intention; and consequently, it must be last in execution: that is, men must first be damned for their disobedience, before God permits them to become disobedient. But let us consider your grounds, in the next place.

Answ. *That God hath some willingnesse to glorifie his distributive justice, as well as vindicative, in rewarding the world with life upon condition of obedience and repentance, as well as with death upon condition of disobedience and impenitency, appeareth from Gods Oath;* As I live (saith the Lord) I have no pleasure in the wicked mans death; but rather that hee should turne from his wickednesse and live. *The usuall answer made to this place seems to mee to straine the word beyond his native simplicity.*

1. *Some say that God speakes not of all the wicked, but of some of the elect onely, who in time are brought on to repentance: but the truth is, hee speaketh of such wicked men, whereof some dye in their sinnes, as is evident by the parallel place.*

2. *Others say, that God speaketh of his antecedent will, going before all causes in the creature, not of his consequent will, following the creature in sinne: but plaine it is, hee speaketh of men now wicked, defiled with originall and actuall sin.*

3. *Others say againe, God speakes not of the secret will of his good pleasure, but of his revealed will: but though I know there be sundry parts of Gods secret will which are not revealed, yet I know no part of his will by oath, doctrine, or historicall narration, that is discrepant from his secret will at all.*

Object. *If you say, Yes: Gods revealed will is that all should repent.*

Resp. 1. *I answer: It is not a part of Gods will revealed by oath, doctrine, or historicall narration; but by a word of command.*

2. *I say, it is a part of his secret will too; I meane, of his good pleasure, that all men should repent: and it is his displeasure if they repent not.*

3. *But there is another part of his good will also, that if they repent they shall not perish; and this also revealed in his word: And thus the will of God revealed in a distinct axiome is alwayes consonant to his secret will, and never frustrated.*

4. *Finally, others say, that God delighteth not in the death of a sinner, as it is the destruction of the creature, but as it is a meanes of the manifestation of his justice. I answer, It is true; but the manifestation of his justice stands, as hee expresseth himselfe, in the removall of the cause of their destruction from his owne will to their will:* As I live (saith the Lord) I desire not the death of a sinner: Turne yee, turne yee; why will yee dye, O house of Israel?

Examin. First, here is some Philosophicall error in distinguishing betweene justice distributive and justice vindicative; which are no more to be distinguished than a *genus* is to be distinguished from his *species*: Justice commutative is only opposite to justice distributive; but justice distributive comprehends under it as well justice vindicative as justice remunerative.

2. Here wee have an anxious discourse to prove that which no man denyes, as before hath been shewed: And on the other side, it is equally as true, that God hath a willingnesse to glorifie his vindicative justice, as well as remunerative; to punish with death any one of his Elect, upon condition of finall disobedience and impenitency, as well as to reward with life, upon condition of obedience and repentance.

3. But it appeares by the Proofe, that some further Point is intended then is yet manifested, and such a one as you seeme rather to insinuate then expresse. For whereas hitherto you have proposed a will of God onely conditionate, the place of Scripture alledged mentions no such conditionate will, which is indifferent to passe either upon the life or death of a man accordingly as hee shall be found to repent or not to repent; but rather intimates a will of God inclining to affect rather the life of man then his death: as it is manifested in these words, *I have no pleasure in the wicked mans death, but rather that hee repent and live.* Now this is nothing congruous to a conditionate will; as before premised: First, because a conditionate will, at the best, is but indifferent, to passe either upon life or death according to the condition proposed. Secondly, if the condition of life be such as whereunto man is not so well disposed, and the condition of death such as whereunto man is most prone; it will follow here-hence, that such a conditionate will is more propense to affect a mans death than life. Thirdly, most of all, in case it be such as that the condition of life

life is never performed; and the condition of death alwayes performed; and the event hereof well knowne to God when hee made this conditionate decree.

4. But whereas you would (I gueſſe) inſinuate, that God doth will the life of the wicked (diſtinguiſhed from Gods Elect) rather then their death, the place alledged is nothing to this purpoſe; as not ſignifying what God doth rather will to come to paſſe, but what God doth take moſt pleaſure in, when it doth come to paſſe, whether it doth come to paſſe or no; for certainly, the life and repentance of the world doth never come to paſſe, according to your opinion.

5. *Junius* renders the place ſo, as that Gods delight is ſignified to be placed in the repentance of a ſinner; *Ne vivam ſi delector morte improbi; ſed delector cum revertitur improbus ut vivat.* And indeed God is glorified by our obedience, as whereby hee is acknowledged to be our ſupreme Lord; not ſo by our diſobedience. And indeed, did God take pleaſure in the death of a ſinner, what ſhould move him to wait for his repentance, and uſe all perſwaſive meanes to bring him to repentance? And it is propoſed to take them off from a deſperate condition, propoſed in theſe words, *Quia defectiones noſtræ & peccata noſtra incumbunt nobis, ideò ipſis nos tabeſcimus ecqui viveremus.* To take them off from this, the Lord ſends his Prophet, charging him and ſaying, *Dic eis, ne vivam ego, dictum Domini, ſi delector morte improbi, ſed cum revertitur improbus à via ſua ut vivat. Revertimini, revertimini à viis veſtris peſſimis; cur enim moreremini, domus Iſraelis?*

6. Be it ſpoken in generall, both of Elect and Reprobate, (yet onely is it directed to them to whom the Prophets of God are ſent;) it followeth not, that God doth will or deſire the repentance of any Reprobate; (though to the confirmation hereof you chiefly tend:) certainly, whoſoever repents, God takes pleaſure in his repentance; and the Scripture ſaith no more: But that he doth not will it or deſire it, out of your owne mouth may bee convinced, ſeeing that God affords not any Reprobate ſuch an effectuall grace as hee fore-ſees will bring them to repentance; but reſerving that for the Elect alone, unto all others hee vouchſafeth onely ſuch a grace as hee knowes full well will never bring any of them unto repentance. And if God would bring any man

unto repentance, who ſhould hinder him? ſhall the will of man? how doth it hinder him in working the repentance of his Elect? cannot hee *omnipotenti facilitate convertere*, (as *Auſtin* ſpeakes) whom he will, *& ex nolentibus volentes facere?* Againe, doth God continue to will their repentance after they are damned, or no? If no: then is hee changed if ever hee willed their repentance.

7. Certainly, he ſpeaks of men defiled with originall and actuall ſinne; for hee ſpeakes of ſuch whom he exhorts to repentance: yet this hinders not but that it may proceed of his antecedent will; for nothing but finall impenitency makes way for Gods conſequent will concerning damnation.

2 Tim. 2. 10. 8. Saint *Paul*, of all his labours, tendred to the good of all ſorts, profeſſeth, that hee ſuffered them for Gods Elect: How much more in Gods intention was the Miniſtry of his Prophets for the Elect ſake? The queſtion is not ſo much about Gods delight in the death of the wicked, as about his delight concerning their repentance and life; and this hath no parallel, *Ezech.* 18. applying it to other then Gods Elect.

9. The third Anſwer, though it ſeemes to mee not congruous enough in reſpect of life; becauſe *revealed will*, in this diſtinction, is uſually taken onely for Gods commandement; and life is no precept: yet is it congruous enough in reſpect of repentance; for it is generally commanded; and conſequently, Gods will of life, if it be called his will revealed, may be reduced to congruity, as conſequent to repentance, which God commands to all; and conſequently, hee may be ſaid, by his revealed will, to will the ſalvation of all. The Anſwer to this is nothing to purpoſe, as ſticking upon the termes, *ſecret* and *revealed*, and not applied to the uſuall acceptions of this diſtinction, which is onely to ſignifie *Gods will of commandement*, which wee all know to be revealed; and *Gods will of purpoſe*, which moſtly is not revealed.

10. It is untrue, that it is Gods good pleaſure that all ſhould repent; for the will of Gods good pleaſure, in the acception of all that ever I read, is onely of that which God will have come to paſſe; and conſequently, of what ſhall come to paſſe; not of what ſhould come to paſſe, to wit, of mans duty; that is generally accounted *voluntas ſigni*, in diſtinction from *voluntas beneplaciti*; and in ſpeciall, wee may call it *voluntas præcepti*, and diſtinguiſh

it

it from *voluntas propoſiti*; this is, What God will have to bee done; that is, what God will have to be our duty to doe. And thus farre it may be accounted the will of Gods good pleaſure (as you call it.) But then, Gods diſpleaſure following hath no congruous oppoſition hereunto; as when you ſay, *It is his diſpleaſure if they repent not*: the contrary whereunto is not as you ſhape it, *It is his good pleaſure that all men ſhould repent*; but rather thus, *It is his good pleaſure if they doe repent.* That diſtinction tends to meere confuſion. Neither yet doe I like this expreſſion, ſhaped never ſo congruouſly: rather it ſhould runne thus, God is well pleaſed when men doe repent, and moſt diſpleaſed when they doe not repent; which is moſt true, but leaſt to the preſent purpoſe, as touching the diſtinction ventilated betweene us, concerning *voluntas ſigni, & voluntas beneplaciti.*

Your ſecond inſtance, of *voluntas beneplaciti*, is no leſſe extravagant; as when you make the object thereof thus; *If they repent, they ſhall not periſh: If they repent not, they ſhall periſh*: for promiſes and rewards are but adjuncts to *voluntas ſigni*, and nothing ſecret, but plainly revealed. But to whom God will make his commandements, back'd with promiſes and threats, effectuall to the working of repentance, this is a ſecret; and this wee commonly account *voluntas beneplaciti.* When you adde, ſaying, *Thus the will of God revealed in a diſtinct axiome, is alwayes conſonant to his revealed will, and never fruſtrated*; You continue ſtill in a miſerable confuſion, worſe rather then better: as when you talke of a disjunct axiome, in reference to that which went before, when no disjunct axiome at all went before, but certaine conditionate axiomes; as theſe, *If they repent, they ſhall not periſh: If they repent not, they ſhall periſh*: whereas disjunct oppoſitions are ſuch as theſe; They ſhall repent or no: They ſhall periſh or no: And to ſay ſuch axiomes are conſonant to Gods ſecret will, is a wild expreſſion; whereas indeed they are neither conſonant nor diſſonant, ſave onely in enuntiating that in an indeterminate manner, which Gods will hath made determinate; and in that reſpect it is diſſonant enough.

Of the cauſe of the death of a ſinner there needeth not to be any queſtion; for undoubtedly, the ſinne of man is the cauſe thereof, in the way of a cauſe meritorious; but not in the way of a cauſe naturally efficient. And as undoubted it is, that Gods will is

the cauſe thereof, as a Judge, in the way of a cauſe naturally efficient; but not in the way of a cauſe meritorious. And as cleare it is, that onely the meritorious cauſe is the chiefe cauſe in this kind; for as much as by the rendring thereof alone, ſatisfaction is made to him that demands the reaſon, why ſuch a one ſuffereth death. But I wonder what you meane to change the former Tranſlation of the Text, thus, *I have no pleaſure in the wicked mans death*, into another, thus, *I will not the death of a ſinner*; For, is it not God that inflicteth death? and doth hee not doe all things according to the counſell of his will? *Epheſ.* 1.11. Yet if it were ſo to be rendred, it will nothing advantage you. And in no other ſenſe can it be ſaid, that hee doth not will it; then in that in which hee is ſaid, not to puniſh willingly, *Lam.* 3. according to the Latine phraſe, when hee doth not puniſh, *Animi cauſa*, but by reaſon of ſome provocation, the ſinne of man urging and moving him thereunto; as is fairely intimated in that, *Heſ.* 11. 8. *How ſhall I give thee up*, Ephraim? *how ſhall I deliver thee, Iſrael?* And, *Eſay* 3. *They provoke the eyes of his glory.*

Anſw. *For a ſecond ground: In the Covenant of Workes you may ſee, as in a glaſſe, what the purpoſe of God is, in the manifeſting his Juſtice upon the world of mankind; as in the Covenant of Grace you may ſee, as in a mirrour, what the purpoſe of God is, in manifeſting his mercy upon the Elect: For as it is in men renued after the Image of God; ſo likewiſe it is in God himſelfe: Such as his Covenant or Promiſe is, ſuch is his Purpoſe. God doth covenant and promiſe in the Covenant of Grace to give life to the Elect, out of his grace in Chriſt: So here doth God covenant and promiſe, in the Covenant of Workes, to give life to* Adam *and all his poſterity, if they continue in obedience of his Law; or if, breaking this Law, they return again to him by repentance; as it is deſcribed at large,* Gen. 4. 7. Levit. 18. 5. Ezek. 18. 5. & 20. 11. & 40. 21. Gal. 3. 12. *Surely then, the purpoſe of Gods juſt retribution is to give life to the world of mankind, upon condition of their obedience, or of their repentance after diſobedience. Say not, Surely God purpoſed nothing but death to the world of mankind (whom hee elected not,) becauſe hee offered them life upon ſuch condition which hee knew was impoſſible for them to keep: for, firſt, in* Adam *they were enabled to keep it; neither impotency in* Adam, *nor efficacy of Gods decree did put upon* Adam *any neceſſity of breaking*

ing it. Againe, in Chriſt they have ſo much knowledge and grace revealed to them, and offered, as is ſufficient to bring them on to ſee their impotency in themſelves, and to ſtirre them up to ſeeke for help, and ſtrength, and life, in him where it is to be found: which if they neglect or deſpiſe, as the Phariſees did, and all the reſt of impenitent ſinners doe, God and his Covenant are blameleſſe, in offering them life, and the meanes of it; their deſtruction is of themſelves.

That Propoſition of yours, *As it is in men renued after the Image of God, ſo likewiſe it is in God himſelfe*; had need of much limitation and qualification, leſt it prove as often falſe as true, or rather more. That which followes; *Such as is his Covenant or Promiſe, ſuch is his Purpoſe*: is likewiſe as often falſe as true. If the Promiſes of God are abſolute, ſuch are his Purpoſes; but if his Promiſes bee conditionall, ſuch are not his Purpoſes. Both *Piſcator* of late, by evidence of Scripture, and *Bradwardine* long before, by demonſtration of Reaſon, have proved, that no will in God is conditionate, *quoad actum volentis*; all the conditions are found, *quoad rem volitam*. And indeed, though the Purpoſes of God are abſolute, yet his Promiſes are therefore conditionate, becauſe they are conformed to the manner of Gods operation with man: For, as God workes in all things agreeable to their natures; ſo in man hee uſeth to worke agreeable to his nature. And therefore, albeit his Purpoſe bee abſolute to bring them to grace and glory, to faith, repentance, and ſalvation; yet hee allures them to faith and repentance by promiſes and threatnings. When you ſay, that, *God doth covenant and promiſe to give life to the Elect, out of his grace in Chriſt*: You might as well have ſaid, that, God promiſeth to give life to them that beleeve and repent; and more congruouſly a great deale; ſeeing the conſcience of our faith and repentance brings us to the aſſurance of our Election; the conſcience of our Election, or of the aſſurance thereof, brings us not unto faith and repentance. But it ſeemes you deſire to ſhape the Promiſes of God in the Covenant of Grace, and in the Covenant of Workes, in ſo different a manner, that the one may ſeeme to bee abſolute, the other conditionall; whereas they are of the ſame nature in both: And as God doth withall intend to give the grace of obedience to the Elect; ſo doth hee as abſolutely intend to deny it to the other. And I wonder you make

Examin. =

not

not mention of the Reprobate in the latter, as of the Elect in the former: Undoubtedly, the Covenant of Workes concernes all to whom it is preached; as well the Elect as the Reprobate. And the Covenant of Grace likewise concernes all to whom it is preached; as well the Reprobate as the Elect. To all it is preached, Whosoever beleeveth shall be saved; as well to the Reprobate as to the Elect: To all it is preached indifferently, Whosoever beleeveth not shall bee damned; as well to the Elect as to the Reprobate: onely, God shewes mercy on whom hee will, in giving the grace of faith; and hardens whom he will, in denying it. God doth covenant (you say) to give life to *Adam* and all his posterity, if they continue in obedience to his Law. This then, undoubtedly, concernes the Elect as well as the Reprobate; for they are a part of *Adams* posterity. But I wonder not a little at this language, speaking in the Present Tense, that God *doth covenant* to give *Adam* life; whereas *Adam* many thousand yeares agoe hath ceased to have any thing to doe with any such Covenant. Therefore this is for some speciall purpose, in joyning *Adam* and his posterity together, as persons covenanted with by God. And I imagine the reason of it to be this: Lest otherwise there could bee no place for continuance in obedience required of all *Adams* posterity; for that presupposeth them to be in the estate of obedience: which was never verified of them all, but as they were in *Adam*, and that in his state of Innocency. But why should wee please our selves with such confusion? Let us consider them apart; and say, that, God did covenant with *Adam* that if hee continued in obedience to his Law; or if breaking his Law hee did returne againe to him by repentance, hee should have life. But what evidence, I pray, have you for this? namely, that God made any such Covenant with *Adam* in the state of Innocency? who ever was found to entertaine any such conceit before you? why might not you as well devise the like Covenant to be made by God with the Angels? Nay, is not the contrary manifest? *In the day thou sinnest thou shalt dye the death.* How could this be verified, if God made any such Covenant with *Adam*? For, if hee were under such a Covenant, hee could not be said to violate it by sinning, but onely by refusing to repent after hee had sinned. And I verily beleeve you have no such meaning, as if you conceived any such Covenant to bee made with *Adam* before his fall; and therefore

Gen. 2.

you

your clapt *Adam* and his posterity together; to the end, that if that which you delivered might not hold of the one, it might of the other. And though it hold of *Adams* posterity, as touching this part, of turning unto God by repentance after sinne committed; yet of them it holds not, as touching the other part of the condition, to wit, of continuance in obedience; for the posterity of *Adam*, through his fall, are quite out of the estate of obedience, till God restores them. Nay, God in this life never restores any to the estate of obedience, which was found in *Adam* before his fall. Out of this confusion you inferre, that, Surely the purpose of Gods just retribution is to give life to the world of mankind, upon condition of their obedience, or of their repentance. As before wee were troubled with confusion, so here wee are againe troubled with an unhappy distinction: For, what doe you meane to distinguish Obedience from Repentance, as if Repentance were not Obedience? Doth not God say as well unto us, *Repent, and believe the Gospel*; as, *If you consent and obey, you shall eat the good things of the land*? Is it fit to distinguish the *Genus* from the *Species*, so as to set one in opposition to the other? Though the contentions of Brethren are as the barrs of a Palace; yet, as Brethren, they are all the Children of the same Father, or Mother, or both. But take wee your meaning; and that by Obedience is to be understood, such a state or condition of obedience as is without all sinne; then let your Position runne plainly thus, *Surely, the purpose of Gods just retribution is to give life to the world of mankind, upon condition of their being without sinne, or of their repentance after obedience.* To this I answer, That, there never was any such Covenant of God with man; I meane, in such sort conditionate: and consequently, there never was any purpose in God to make any such Covenant with man; at least for the time past: As for the times to come, let them speake for themselves, by their owne experience, when they come. But that never any such Covenant had place hitherto, between God and man, it is manifest: For, since the Fall of *Adam* all being borne in sinne, there is no place for such a Covenant, as touching the first part of the condition, which is, of being without sinne. And before the Fall of *Adam* there was no place for this Covenant, as touching the latter part of the condition; as I presume you will not deny: onely the confusion of these two states, before the Fall and after

Esa. 1.

the Fall, hath brought forth this wild conceit of such a Covenant. By that which followeth, it seemes that all these conceptions tend to no worse end, then to justifie Gods disposition towards the Reprobate. And it is great pity that so good an end, as the justifying of God, should bee brought about by no more congruous courses then these. But I would faine know, what blemish should redound to the nature of God, if hee should intend nothing but death to the world of mankind? yet your selfe will acknowledge, that hee might have intended nothing but annihilation: And is not annihilation as bad as death? But your meaning is, by death to understand sorrow. And is there not just cause to prefer sorrow before death? Yea, but your meaning is, of sorrow in the highest degree, and that everlasting. Why, but if it be no blemish to God to intend nothing but sorrow in seven degrees to the world of mankind, why should it be any blemish to him to intend nothing but sorrow in a degree more? And if it be no blemish to God to intend nothing but sorrow to the world of mankind for millions of yeares, why should it be any blemish to his reputation, to intend to the world of mankind nothing but everlasting sorrow? Yet whom doe you oppose in this? Who ever said, that God did intend nothing but death to the world of mankind? those on whom you obtrude this conceit, doe not affirme this of the world of mankind, but onely of the Reprobates; if they doe affirme any such thing. And why, I pray, should the Reprobates be taken for the world of mankind, rather than the Elect? Neither doth any man say, that God did intend nothing but death to the Reprobates: Hee did intend to them all life as well as death; but withall, that all the posterity of *Adam* should be borne, or at least conceived, in sinne; and also that many thousands should perish in that sinne wherein they were conceived and borne. And I presume you dare not deny this: which yet is the harshest proceeding of God, above all others, except his dealing with his owne Sonne. As for others, he intended to expose them to actuall sinnes of infidelity and impenitency, by denying to them that grace which alone would preserve them from such sinnes; as your selfe spare not to professe: and yet for all this you would obtrude upon us a strange conceit, and that as very reasonable; namely, That God did not intend their death onely, but their life also: whereas God is nothing at all advantaged

hereby

hereby in his reputation, but onely in words, which is no reall relieſe to his honour, but the adding of another injury (if that bee an injury unto him, as you conceive;) namely, to mock him alſo. And if wee ſhall nothing pleaſure him by a lye, *lying for God, as man doth for man, to gratifie him*; ſurely wee ſhall doe him no pleaſure by thus mocking him. I would you had tried your ſtrength in oppugning their opinion to the uttermoſt, who maintaine God to carry himſelfe as abſolutely in the way of Reprobation, as in the way of Election: I would gladly have conſidered it. But let us conſider your preſent diſcourſe: Firſt, you ſay, *They were in* Adam *enabled to keep the condition; therefore ſay not, God intended nothing but death to them.* I pray transferre the caſe to the Angels; were not they alſo enabled to keep the condition of life, as well as their fellowes? yet, did not God grant his Elect Angels ſuch a grace as whereby hee knew they would ſtand; denying ſuch a grace unto the others; and that as abſolutely as hee granted it unto the other? And could hee not as abſolutely have granted this grace unto them that fell, and denyed it to them that ſtood? And what would have beene the iſſue, but quite contrary? *& verſis luxiſſet curia fatis.*

Now let any man, that is not poſſeſſed with a prejudicate conceit, conſider, whether God did not as abſolutely will the damnation of the one, as the ſalvation of the other; making the one *amplius adjutos* (as *Auſtin* ſpeakes) then the other? For the abſoluteneſſe of Gods Election of Angels, is ſeene by the abſoluteneſſe of his giving them ſuch a grace as to keep them from ſinne. And if hee doth as abſolutely deny others the ſame grace, as hee muſt needs; (for before the firſt ſinne of Angels there could bee no cauſe moving God to deny them grace;) it will follow, that their Reprobation was as abſolute as the others Election. Yet what a poore relieving of Gods reputation is this, to ſay, that *Judas* had power in *Adam* to keep the condition of life propoſed to him; though ſince his Fall hee hath not: yet wee beleeve that *Adam* is ſaved, who bereaved *Judas* of his ability; and *Judas* damned, for not keeping that whereunto hee had no ability; and that through the Fall of *Adam*. Further, obſerve I pray you the miſerable conſequents of this your Argument, as it runnes thus, in few words; *In* Adam *we were enabled to keep the Condition; Therefore ſay not, that God intended nothing but death to the Reprobate.*

probate. By the ſame reaſon I may diſpute thus: In *Adam* they were enabled to breake the condition of life; therefore, *Say not that God intended nothing but life to his Elect. But as hee intended ſalvation, and not damnation onely, to the Reprobates; In like ſort hee intended damnation, and not ſalvation onely to the Elect*: Eſpecially conſidering, that not in *Adam* onely, but in themſelves alſo, they are able enough to breake it; and the beſt of them have that in them that deſerves damnation, nothing that deſerves ſalvation. As for the Reprobates, there neither was nor is any thing in them that fits them for ſalvation. It is ſtrange that theſe incongruities ſhould not bee diſcerned; or being diſcerned, men ſhould be ſo little moved with them. But theſe are dayes of vengeance; and when a good man erres, and that in weighty matters, I conſider not any judgement of God upon him, but upon the world rather; that hereby are ſo much the more countenanced in their erroneous wayes, which are advantageous to fleſh and bloud; and therefore they delight in them, and thereby become the more worthy to be given over to illuſions, to beleeve lyes. Let mee touch upon that alſo, as where you ſay, *It was not the efficacy of Gods decree that did put upon* Adam *any neceſſity of breaking it*. This, I confeſſe, is a plauſible ſpeech now adayes, and apt to bee taken up; eſpecially coming from good mens mouthes, to choake others withall, who feare not to give God the glory of his power, with as much truth, and with a greater diſtinction and plainneſſe; wee ſay with *Aquinas*, that, *Gods will is ſo efficacious, as to cauſe all things to come to paſſe after ſuch a manner as they doe come to paſſe; to wit, neceſſary things neceſſarily, and contingent things contingently, or freely, whether in good or evill.* And if you ſpare to ſpeake with the Holy Ghoſt, yet wee will not; but profeſſe, that *Both* Herod *and* Pontius Pilate, *with the Gentiles and people of Iſrael, were gathered together to doe that which Gods hand and Gods counſell determined before to be done.* And with *Auſtin*, *Non aliquid fit, niſi Omnipotens fieri velit, vel ſinendo ut fiat, vel ipſe faciendo.*

Enchirid. cap. 95.

So that even thoſe things which God *ſinit fieri, vult fieri*; Good things he will have come to paſſe, by his working of them; evill things hee will have come to paſſe, by his ſuffering of them. Nay, otherwiſe it were impoſſible hee ſhould foreknow them; for unleſſe they are future, they are not knowable to be future.

But

But how can it be, that things contingent, and in their owne nature indifferent, as well to be not future as future; how, I ſay, is it poſſible that they ſhould paſſe out of this indifferent condition into a condition determinate; and things meerely poſſible in their owne nature, become future without a cauſe? And what cauſe can be deviſed of this tranſition, but the will of God? For, from everlaſting, nothing was extant to cauſe them of things poſſible to become future; but God himſelfe: and in God himſelfe, nothing can be imagined to be the cauſe hereof, but the will of God. This is the inſoluble demonſtration that cuts the throat of *Scientia media*, whereupon the Jeſuites and *Arminians*, and all that oppoſe the abſoluteneſſe of Gods proceedings, doe, and muſt relye; either wittingly or unwittingly, and whether they will or no; unleſſe they will directly turne Atheiſts, and with *Cicero* deny that God fore-knowes things that are to come. So that upon ſuppoſition of Gods will to permit *Adam* to fall, it was neceſſary that *Adam* ſhould fall; neceſſary, I ſay, that hee ſhould fall: But how? Not neceſſarily, but contingently, and freely: and no other neceſſity is at this day found in man for the performing of any particular ſinfull act, but ſuch as is joyned with liberty; and that in ſuch ſort, as that the neceſſity is only *Secundum quid*; the liberty is *Simpliciter*: ſo called, I ſay, in reſpect of any particular act. But, I confeſſe, there is an abſolute neceſſity of ſinning, in generall, laid upon man by the Fall of *Adam*; whereby it comes to paſſe, that whether a man commits a ſinfull act, then queſtionleſſe hee ſinneth; or whether hee omit a ſinfull act, yet therein hee ſinneth alſo; in as much as hee doth not abſtaine from it in a gracious manner. I come to the ſecond Reaſon: Againe, you ſay, *In Chriſt they have ſo much knowledge and grace reveated to them, and offered, as is ſufficient to bring them on to ſee their impotency in themſelves, and to ſtirre them up to ſeeke for help and ſtrength, and life in him, where it is to bee found; which if they neglect and deſpiſe, as the Phariſees did, and all impenitent ſinners doe, God and his Covenant are blameleſſe, in offering them life, and the meanes of it; their deſtruction is of themſelves.* I have read ſuch manner of diſcourſe as this often in *Carvinus*, that buſie *Arminian*; I am ſorry to read it in the writings of good men; eſpecially when I find it not one jot mended in them. Yet all this I ſee ſtill tends to a gracious end, even to

the juſtifying of God; as when you ſay, *Their deſtruction is of themſelves.* But ſo doe *Arminians* alſo pretend; to wit, the juſtifying of God in the way of Reprobation: but the iſſue is, to juſtifie themſelves, and glorifie themſelves in the way of Election. But, I pray you, what thinke you of Infants that periſh in Originall ſinne; how is their deſtruction of themſelves? Is it of themſelves that they are borne in ſinne? Yet I preſume you will not ſay, with *Arminians*, that all Infants that dye in their infancy, whether they be the Children of *Turkes* and *Saracens*, yet are ſaved, as well as the children of beleeving Parents. Againe; was not *Pharaohs* deſtruction of himſelfe alſo, for not letting Iſrael goe? yet, will you deny that God hardned his heart, that hee ſhould not let Iſrael goe? *Sihon* King of *Heſhbon*, was not his deſtruction of himſelfe, in that hee would not ſuffer Iſrael to paſſe by him, though they promiſed to goe by the high-way, and to turne neither to the right hand nor to the left, and to pay for all that they received of them, both meat and drinke? nevertheleſſe it is ſaid, that, *The Lord hardned his ſpirit, and made his heart obſtinate, becauſe hee would deliver him into the hands of the Iſraelites.* The deſtruction of *Abimelech* and of the *Shechemites*, was it not of themſelves? yet ſurely, God it was that ſent an evill ſpirit betweene *Abimelech* and the men of *Shechem*, that the cruelty againſt the ſeventy ſonnes of *Jerubbaal*, and their bloud, might come and be laid upon *Abimelech* their brother, which had ſlaine them; and upon the men of *Shechem* which had aided him to kill his brethren. But to proceed: The face of your diſcourſe ſeemes to tend to the maintenance of a ſufficient grace in the Reprobates themſelves; whereof there is much queſtion: but yet you expreſſe onely a ſufficient grace without them, whereof there is no queſtion. For, undoubtedly, in Gods word (whereof even Reprobates are partakers as well as the Elect) there is grace ſufficient in the way of inſtruction and revelation; no man makes queſtion of this. Undoubtedly, therein is contained all things neceſſary both for faith and manners, and ſo to bring them to ſalvation, if they will obey it. But all the queſtion is, whether they have any ſufficiency of grace to enable them to obey it? I preſume your ſelfe will not avouch this. And the *Pelagians* of old acknowledged a ſufficiency of grace in the way of doctrine and inſtruction. Onely you ſay, *There is ſufficient grace given them to bring*

Judg. 9.

them

them to see their impotency. But how doe you prove this? The naturall man commonly is too preiant of his ability; *Dicere solet humana superbia* (saith *Austin*) *si scissem, fecissem.* What was *Pauls* meaning when hee said of himselfe, *Rom.*7.9. *I once was alive without the Law?* I should think this impotency cannot be discerned without the life of grace. For, like as a dead man naturally is not sensible of his death; so hee that is dead in sinne, is nothing sensible of this his sinfull condition. But howsoever, surely grace revealed onely hath no congruity to such a worke, as to bring a man to see his impotency; for what greater grace in the kind of revelation then the word of God? let this word testifie, that *a man is shaped in wickednesse, and in sinne conceived*; *and that hee is dead in sinne.* Is this sufficient to make him see his impotency? Is the hearing of Gods word sufficient to make him beleeve it? why then is it not sufficient to take away mens blindnesse? and why then doth not every one that hears it, cease to be blind; and consequently, cease to bee lame, and deafe; yea, and cease to be dead also? Nay, which is more, suppose a Physician discovers a man to be in a dangerous estate, when hee dreames of nothing lesse, and suppose the party beleeves it upon his word; yet here-hence it followeth not, that hee seeth the dangerous estate wherein hee is, untill hee hath some feeling of it. So likewise, if hee should beleeve the word, telling him that hee is unable to doe any thing that is good; yet hee shall not be said to see it, till hee hath some feeling of it: and whence can this feeling proceed, but from some principle of life that must be shed into his soule, that hee may have a feeling of that miserable estate wherein hee is by nature; otherwise though upon supposition hee should beleeve it in Gods word, yet hee should not see it in himselfe. Further, you say, *It is sufficient to stirre him up to seek for help, and strength, and life, in him where it is to bee found.* A strange conceit, that a man should seek for life, whereas if hee hath not life hee is dead; and was it ever known that a dead man sought for life? well *Martha* might seeke for the restoring of life to her dead brother *Lazarus*, but surely *Lazarus* himselfe, being dead, neither did, nor could seeke for life. A man that hath life, may be said to labour for life; that is, to hold it, when hee is in danger of losing life: but for a dead man to seeke for life is more then miraculous; for it is utterly impossible. When the Angell came downe into the

Poole

Poole of *Betheſda*, the poore Creple had never a whit the more ſufficiency to enter in, had his heart beene as lame to deſire as his body to goe, notwithſtanding that he ſaw ſo good an opportunity, hee ſhould make no more haſte to deſire the benefit, then his body could to enjoy it. Againe, no man ſeekes for that hee deſires not; neither can hee deſire ought, unleſſe hee know it, and loves it. And is it poſſible that a man ſhould know the precious nature of the life of grace, and be in love with it, and yet without the life of grace? Is the knowledge of the precious nature of the ſtate of grace, and the love thereof, a fruit of the fleſh thinke you? But, by that which followes, it ſeemes this is not your meaning; but you ſuppoſe, that notwithſtanding all the operation of grace mentioned, they may deſpiſe it: In which caſe, they neither love it, nor underſtand the precious nature of it; for no man deſpiſeth that which hee loves, and accounts precious: Therefore this ſtirring up ſeemes to bee nothing but perſwaſion and exhortation. Now this, as *Auſtin* long agoe delivered, *Doctrina generaliter comprehenditur*; and we willingly grant, that the word preached doth equally exhort all that heare it, to faith, to repentance, to prayer, in ſome of which, or in all which, conſiſts the ſeeking of life. And no man makes queſtion, but the word of God ſufficiently performes its part, in exhortation to faith, to repentance, to prayer: but the Phariſees deſpiſed this, and ſo doe moſt; and God is blameleſſe. But of any power that they have to beleeve, repent, and pray, upon the doing whereof they ſhould obtaine life, your ſelfe are content to ſay nothing at all; but keep your ſelfe unto generall phraſes, which are very apt to deceive us; and this is the courſe not onely of them that are in love with their owne errors; but with good men alſo, when out of a deſire to juſtifie God, and not content with that ſimplicity of ſatisfaction which is laid forth unto us in holy Scripture, and ſeemes harſh to fleſh and bloud, making them cry out, *Durus eſt hic ſermo*, they ſhape unto themſelves other courſes, more convenient (as they thinke) to give ſatisfaction; yet not ſo much unto themſelves, as unto others: but all in vaine; for fleſh and bloud will receive no ſatisfaction in the plaine truth of God.

Anſw. *A third Reaſon then to prove that God purpoſed life to the world, upon condition of their obedience and repentance, is taken from the end God aimed at: As hee declares himſelfe, to offer*

meanes

meanes of ſalvation unto the world: which is not in the firſt place to harden, and to leave without excuſe; but to bring them to the knowledge of God and of themſelves, to repentance, to the ſeeking after God, to the purging of themſelves from ſinne, and to peace. To the Gentiles God gave the workes of Creation and Providence, and his Law written in their hearts; to reveale the knowledge of God to them, to teach them to doe the things of the Law, to judge of them that doe amiſſe, and thereby be brought to condemne themſelves doing the ſame things; to lead them to repentance, to move them to ſeek after the Lord. And thus much light Chriſt enlightneth every man withall that cometh into this world. From whence alſo it was, that God vouchſafed heavenly dreames and viſions even to the Gentiles, That hee might withdraw them from their ſinnes, and hide their pride, and ſave their ſoules from the pit. *But becauſe this light alone did not prevaile with the Gentiles, as to bring them to the knowledge of God in Chriſt, therefore it pleaſed God in the fulneſſe of time to ſend the preaching of the Goſpel amongſt them; and in the meane time, not to judge them nor condemne them for their not beleeving in Chriſt, of whom they had not heard; nor for tranſgreſſing the Law of workes, which they had not received; but onely for ſinning againſt the law of nature, which was written in their hearts, and expounded to them daily by the workes of Creation and Providence, and ſealed up to them by particular amplification, partly by their* Conſciences accuſing or excuſing, *Rom.* 2.15. *partly* by dreames and viſions, *Job* 33.15,16.

To the Jewes God revealed his Covenant clearly and fully; ſent his Prophets among them early and late; gave them deliverances; chaſtened them with many wholeſome afflictions; yea, ſent his holy Spirit among them: And all this, in the firſt place, not to harden, no not carnall Iſrael; nor to leave them without excuſe; but to purge them, to humble them, and to prove them, and to doe them good in the latter end. And when theſe ends were not attained, hee complaines hee had uſed theſe meanes in vaine: which plainly argueth his firſt and chiefeſt intent was to heale, and not to harden. In fulneſſe of time God ſent his Sonne into the world, not to condemne it, or any thing in it; but that the world might bee ſaved through him: implying, that even that part of the world which is condemned for refuſing of Chriſt, it was not

Gods chiefe intent to send Christ to procure their condemnation, but their salvation rather. If they should plead their condemnation to bee unjust, for unbeleefe; because they were not able to beleeve, Ver. 18. *our Saviour answers, by a reasonable prevention,* Ver. 19. This is their condemnation, *viz. the just cause of their condemnation,* that when light came into the world, men loved darknesse rather then light: *men chose rather to cleave to their sinfull estates and wayes of darknesse, than to follow the light of the meanes of grace, which might have brought them on forward to beleeve in Christ. Again, when Christ lived here in the world, and was the Minister of Circumcision, and so might speake and doe some thing as man; yet as man he went not to doe his owne will, but the will of his Father who sent him: and yet, how willing and earnest was hee to gather* Jerusalem *under his wings; even his wings in which lay healing and salvation? A signe it was the will of God to have healed and saved that part of* Jerusalem *which would not. And when our Saviour with tears tells* Jerusalem, Oh that thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things that doe belong unto thy peace! *doth hee not intimate, that God had even to that day carried thoughts of peace unto them; and accordingly to send them meanes of peace, even those that should never from that day forward enjoy the like means of peace?*

Finally, God sent his Spirit into the world, to convince it of sin; because they beleeved not in Christ: Which argueth, that the Spirit did not onely perswade them to beleeve in Christ; but did convince them also that it was their sin, that they did not attaine to beleeve on him. Now, the Spirit of God moveth to nothing, but what hee knoweth to bee according to the will of God: And therefore the Spirit beares witnesse, the will of God is, the world of unbeleevers shall not bee shut out from Christ, if they shut not out themselves through unbeleefe.

Examin. Still you proceed to prove that which no man denyes: namely, that God purposed life to the world, upon condition of obedience and repentance: provided, that you understand it aright: namely, that obedience and repentance is ordained of God, as a condition of life; not of Gods purpose. Otherwise it were a very wild expression to say, that, God ordained that obedience and repentance should be the condition of Gods ordination: Or, that God purposed that obedience and repentance should be the condition

of

of Gods purpoſe. Yet, by the way, I deſire to know whether you exclude faith? If you doe, what ground have you to prove that God ever purpoſed that any of *Adams* poſterity, coming to ripeneſſe of age, ſhould be ſaved upon the condition of obedience and repentance without faith? Laſt of all, on the other ſide, it is as undoubtedly true, that God ordained, that whoſoever, coming to ripe yeares, ſhould not beleeve and repent, ſhould be damned; the very elect not excepted: Not that any ſuch conditionate decrees are agreeable unto God; but upon ſuch decrees as were abſolute in God, ſuch Propoſitions as theſe are naturally inferred; Whoſoever beleeveth and repenteth, ſhall be ſaved; Whoſoever beleeveth not and repenteth not, ſhall be damned. One thing I had almoſt forgotten: In the former Section you ſpake of a Purpoſe of God to ſave the world upon condition of obedience or repentance, in a disjunctive manner: now you are come off from that, and turne your former disjunctive into a copulative, ſaying, that God purpoſed to ſave the world upon condition of their obedience and repentance: This argueth that you are not well grounded in your owne opinion. Howſoever, your third reaſon is drawn from the end which God aimed at in offering meanes of ſalvation to the world, which is not (ſay you) in the firſt place to harden, or leave them without excuſe; but to bring them to the knowledge of God and of themſelves, to repentance, to the ſeeking after God, to the purging of themſelves from ſinne, and to peace. I am content, firſt, to conſider what you ſay; ſecondly, how you prove, who ever ſaid, that God offered meanes of ſalvation to any to this end, that hee might harden them? Meanes of grace were never (that I know of) called meanes of obduration. Hardening followeth hereupon by accident; but meanes of grace harden not. But when meanes of grace are offered, the corruption of mans heart, uncorrected by the ſpirit of regeneration, is apt to ſuggeſt carnall conſiderations, ſuch as are apt to make a man obſtinately ſtand out againſt them. The motion that *Iſrael* made to *Sihon*, to paſſe through his Country, hardened him not; but the feare of inconveniencies and dangers, more than enough, upon the paſſage of ſo great an Army through his Country, in all likelihood, was it that hardened him; and God is ſaid to harden him, in not correcting that feare, but moving him according to that projecting diſpoſition wherein hee found him. And mark how *Cajetan* commenteth

menteth upon these words, *Utrumque hominis partem (spiritum & cor, hoc est, superiorem & inferiorem) male dispositum à Deo, intellige negativè penes dona gratuita, positivè autem quoad judicium inclinationem & prosecutionem boni sensibilis. Ita quod Deus spiritum regis durum (hoc est, non cedentem petitionibus) reddidit, & non dando ei gratiam acquiescendi, & cooperando eidem ad affectum securitatis & boni proprii.* When *Moses* came to *Pharaoh*, to require him, in the name of the Lord, to let *Israel* goe; this was not that that hardened him; but his owne pride, superstition, and covetousnesse: Neither did Gods judgements harden him; for it is divers times signified, that when hee found himselfe eased, then hee hardned his heart: and in other places, in the way of an adversative, when 'tis said, that *yet* Pharaoh *hardened his heart*; and the like. This also doth remove the cause of hardening his heart from Gods judgements; yet, notwithstanding, it cannot bee denyed, but that when God offers the meanes of grace to many, hee doth it with a purpose to harden their hearts; if so be hee entertaines any such purpose at all, as your selfe grants hee doth; for Gods purposes are eternall and immutable. As for your qualification of it, by saying, Hee doth not offer meanes of grace, in the first place, to harden; It is a strange expression, whereof, I am perswaded, you are not able to give any account; but, hand over head, cast out such a phrase as seemes agreeable to your Tenet. For, consider I pray, this first place you speake of, is it in intention, or in execution? It cannot be in intention; for, in intention there is no order in things, but in respect of end and meanes: but, neither obduration is a fit meanes to salvation, nor salvation a fit meanes to obduration. Neither can it be in execution; for, in execution salvation is not found at all, but onely obduration, in the men of the world you speake of. Therefore, your meaning must not be of primacy in place or order, but in principality; as much as to say, Not chiefly to harden, but chiefly to bring to repentance. But none of your Proofes come neare the making of this good, as wee shall see in due place. In the meane time, I disprove it thus; No wise man doth chiefly intend that which hee meanes not to bring to passe at all; Now, God doth purpose to harden them, as your selfe confesse, though not chiefly: but God doth not purpose to save them; for, if hee did, who could hinder him? This is the foule blemish of your opinion; plainly denying

denying Gods omnipotency, as *Auſtin* long agoe diſcourſed: and yet you ſwallow this with facility, though a bit as great as a Camel. I know full well *Arminius* his ſhifts to eaſe himſelfe of this imputation; I would gladly bee acquainted with any other mans inventions alſo. As for the other end, impugned by you, to wit, *to leave them without excuſe*; that, indeed, wee grant may more commodiouſly be accounted an end intended by God than the former: neither doe you deny it to be intended by God, onely you ſay, it is not chiefly intended by him; yet this is ſuch a thing as God brings to paſſe, to wit, their unexcuſableneſſe; but their repentance hee never brings to paſſe: and is it fit to ſay, that God chiefly intends that which ſhall never come to paſſe, as hee well knowes, rather than that which infallibly ſhall come to paſſe, and that by his procurement, as himſelfe well knowes? Thus I have conſidered what you ſay: Now I come to conſider how well you prove what you have ſaid. *To the Gentiles* (you ſay) *God gave the workes of Creation and Providence, and his Law written in their hearts, to reveale the knowledge of God to them, to teach them to doe the things of the Law, to judge them that doe amiſſe, and thereby to be brought to condemne themſelves doing the ſame things; to lead them to repentance, to move them to ſeeke after the Lord.* Like as it were not fit to ſay, that God giveth us his word to this end, that hee might reveale himſelfe unto us, (for ſo I had rather ſay, than to ſay hee reveales the knowledge of himſelfe unto us; becauſe, the very giving of his word is the revealing of himſelfe unto us:) In like ſort, it is not fit to ſay, that, To the Gentiles God gave the workes of Creation and Providence, and his Law written in their hearts, to reveale himſelf unto them; for, like as the word in its kind, ſo the workes of God in their kind, and the Law written in our hearts, are the revelation of God unto the world: God, in ancient times, teaching the world, διὰ πραγμάτων, as afterwards hee did, διὰ γραμμάτων, as *Chryſoſtome* hath obſerved long agoe. But ſuppoſe all this were granted you, yet is it nothing to purpoſe; for here is not the leaſt intimation of any compariſon between the objects of Gods intention; to ſignifie what God did intend in the firſt place, or chiefly; and what in the next, or not chiefly. Againe, all this, as touching his not revealing himſelfe unto the world, is rather ſubſervient to the end impugned by you, to wit, the leaving them without ex-

cuſe, then oppoſite thereunto; for, had not God in ſome ſort revealed himſelfe unto them, they had not been left without excuſe; neither had there been any place for hardning them to reſiſt Gods truth, if the truth of God had not been ſome way or other manifeſted to them. That of aiming to bring them to repentance, and the reſt of the ſame nature, is moſt for your purpoſe, if you were able to make it good: But when wee are not wel-grounded in the way that wee take, no marvell if wee multiply expreſſions, that when ſome faile us, wee may take hold of other. Sure I am, it is apt to confound the judgement of him that, in the ſearch of truth, ſhall addreſſe himſelfe to examine it. Now, that God did not at all intend their repentance, I have already proved; for had hee intended it, it ſhould come to paſſe, hee would have given it them, ſeeing it cannot be had without Gods gift, as the Scripture teſtifies, 2 *Tim.* 2. 25, 26. *Acts* 5. 31. & 11. 18. and as *Auſtin* long agoe hath expreſſed it, *contra Julian. lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. *Quantam libet præbuerit patientiam, niſi Deus dederit, quis agat pœnitentiam?* But wee are apt to be deceived by phraſes of ſpeech, which, carrying many times an ambignous ſignification, and being plauſible to procure credence one way, is, hand over head, ſo carryed, as if it were nothing leſſe true the other way alſo: As for example, To intend repentance, is a plauſible attribute to be given unto God; but it hath a double ſignification, the one that hee intends it ſhall be mans duty to repent; and in this ſenſe it is not more plauſible than true: the other is, that God doth intend they ſhall repent; and this is no more true than plauſible; for as much as God intends to give repentance to none but to his Elect: like as, *de facto*, hee brings none to repentance but his Elect, according to that of *Auſtin*, *contra Jul. Pelag. lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *Iſtorum neminem* (ſaith hee, ſpeaking of the Reprobate) *adducit ad ſalubrem ſpiritualemque pœnitentiam, qua homo reconciliatur Deo in Chriſto, ſive illis ampliorem patientiam, ſive non imparem præbeat.* As for that of Gods leading to repentance, *Rom.* 2. 4. I anſwer, firſt, I had thought that had been delivered rather of the Jewes than of the Gentiles; and *Acts* 17. 30. the Apoſtle doth clearly ſignifie, that the admonition of Gentiles to come to repentance, was reſerved for the time of the Goſpel; *The times of this ignorance God regarded not, but now hee admoniſheth all men every where to repent.* And in reaſon, faith and repentance

are inseparable; and therefore, where there was no admonition unto faith, how could there be admonition unto repentance? And who would not rather incline to think, that the Gentiles (taking them in separation from the Church of God) had the knowledge of God and of his Law given them, not to bring them to repentance that they might be saved, (for I acknowledge no sufficiency of instruction granted them hereunto) but rather for the ordering of their lives in morall conversation, and for the politique government of the world, lest otherwise all things should run to disorder and confusion? And, as *Austin* saith, that the meanes of grace are granted to some, *ut proficiant* thereby, *ad exteriorem vitæ emendationem, quo mitius puniantur.*

Secondly, Gods leading to repentance, in that place, is attributed to the goodnesse of God, which is shewed in his patience and long-suffering; as if it signified no more than giving way unto repentance.

Thirdly, take it as rigorously as you will, it cannot signifie more than God performes by his word, and preaching of the Gospel: For, can you imagine that God performes more by his workes in leading men unto repentance, than by his word? Now, Gods leading to repentance by his word, is but his admonishing them to repent; *Acts* 17.30. *Now he admonisheth all men every where to repent.* And here-hence it followes not, that God doth will their repentance any otherwise then *voluntate præcepti*, not *voluntate propositi*, or *bene-placiti*; for if hee did, then must hee needs give them the grace of repentance. Yet, I confesse, in this *voluntas præcepti* is included *voluntas propositi*, in some sense; which yet nothing serves your turne, though some equivocation makes it seeme plausible, taking it hand over head in the generall; for it signifies withall, that it is the will of Gods good pleasure that they ought to repent, and it is their duty to repent: But there is much difference between these two Propositions, Its my good pleasure that it shall be your duty to repent; and, It is my good pleasure that you shall repent, and therefore I will give you the grace of repentance. As for the second place of importance, drawn out of *Job* 33. vers. 15, 16, 17. of Gods providence in *vouchsafing heavenly dreames and visions unto the Gentiles, that hee might withdraw them from their sinnes, and hide their pride, and save their soules from the pit*: This likewise, in two respects, is nothing

thing for the purpose: For, first, this is spoken of such a time as wherein there was no partition-wall, as afterwards was erected, between the Jewes and Gentiles; and therefore you doe not well to apply this unto the Gentiles, in distinction from the Church of God: for, was not *Job*, and such like, in those dayes, of the Church of God? doth not God send his friends unto him, that hee might sacrifice for them, God himselfe promising to accept it? Secondly, you are to prove, that God doth intend the repentance of those in whom hee doth not effect repentance: But *Elihu*, in *Job*, speaks of God intending the repentance in those in whom hee doth effect repentance; as it appeares, Vers. 16, & 23, 24, 25. and yet I deny not but God may intend a kind of repentance even in the wicked; to wit, *exteriorem vitæ emendationem*, as *Austin* speaks; and so deliver them from judgement temporall, and make also their damnation more tolerable. Here you passe over from Gods naturall providence to a more gracious providence, but not with a right foot; as when you say, that *because this light alone did not so farre prevaile with the Gentiles, as to bring them to the knowledge of God in Christ; Therefore it pleased God, in the fulnesse of time, to send the preaching of the Gospel amongst them*: You should have said rather, Because this light alone could not prevaile: but so, perhaps, you had much prejudiced your owne Tenet. I say, you should have rather said so; seeing you undertake to give the cause of this enterchange of the providence of God: For, to say onely, It did not prevaile; is not to alledge any tolerable cause thereof; especially, considering that you make the blame hereof wholly to lie upon mans wilfulnesse: for by the same reason you might introduce a further course of Gods more gracious providence to bring men unto repentance, than any hee hath undertaken yet; for even the preaching of the Gospel, thereby admonishing men to repent, doth not prevaile with most. There is another incongruity, as when you say, *This light of nature alone did not prevaile*; as if you would imply, that the light of grace alone doth prevaile; which, I presume, you will confesse, is notoriously untrue; and that not onely illumination of the mind, but the affection of the heart by the finger of God is necessarily required to bring men unto repentance. As for that which followeth therein, I doe most willingly and freely concurre with you, acknowledging that God condemnes none

for

for not beleeving in Christ, of whom they had not heard; nor for transgressing the Law of *Moses*, which they had not received; but onely for sinning against the Law of nature, which was written in their hearts: For I verily beleeve, that where there is no Law, there is no transgression. But, I presume, you deliver this onely in reference to men of ripe yeares, and doe not concurre with *Arminians*, in maintaining that all infants dying in their infancy are saved. Thus, from Gods providence concerning the Gentiles, I come unto his providence concerning the Jewes.

2. Of the sufficiency of outward meanes of grace granted unto the Jewes, to bring them unto repentance, no man makes question: yet seeing that among them, all were not precious, but many were found vile enough, and reprobate silver, according to that, *Rom.9.6. All are not Israel which are of Israel*; and that of the Prophet, *Esay* 10. 22. *Though the number of the children of Israel were as the sand of the sea, yet but a remnant shall be saved:* and how few were those represented by the basket of good figs, *Jer.* 24. 2. in comparison to those other *naughty figs, which could not be eaten they were so evill?* That God did intend the salvation and repentance of those to whom hee never gave repentance and salvation, I hold it as impossible for you or any man to prove, as to pull God down from the throne of his omnipotency, or disrobe him of his immutable perfection: For, unlesse God continues to intend their repentance and salvation, even when they are damned, hee must be mutable; and if hee did will and desire their salvation, the reason why they failed of salvation must needs be, because God was not able to procure it. I never met yet with any other then vile shifts, to avoyd these consequences, both in *Arminius*, and others that follow him. But consider wee your proofes: nay, what proofe doe you bring to prove the point you undertake, namely, that God doth not onely intend their repentance, but that in the first place; and yet you cannot deny but that this, which you say God intends in the first place, never comes to passe: whereas the other, which God intends (you confesse) though in a latter place, doth come to passe. But because I think it were absurd to conceive, that God intends their repentance whom hee purposeth to harden, lest they should convert, and God should heale them; therefore I am willing to consider what you bring to the contrary. Your first place is out of *Deut.*8.16. *Who*

fed thee in the wildernesse with manna, which thy fathers knew not, to humble thee, and to prove thee, and that hee might doe thee good in thy latter end. That of *humbling thee, Junius* and *Piscator* reads thus, *ut affligeret te*; belike, partly in reference to that which followeth, *and to prove thee*; (for as much as temporall humiliation hath more congruity to the proving of them, than spirituall; as whereby they humble themselves, and which followeth the proving of them, rather than goeth before it;) partly in reference to the third Verse, going before, where it is said more at full, *Therefore hee humbled thee, and made thee hungry, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know it; that he might teach thee, that man liveth not by bread onely.* By which words wee may gather a faire interpretation of that you alledge: If it be spoken of humiliation spirituall, thus, *Hee fed thee with manna to humble thee*; that is, to teach thee to humble thy selfe: and so indeed his providence, providing alike to them all, did equally teach them all to humble themselves. But did God intend that every one should, *de facto*, humble himselfe? why then did hee *not give them eyes to see, and eares to heare, and an heart to perceive*, as *Deut.*29.4. *Moses* tells them plainly, saying, *Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and eares to heare, unto this day.* I deny not but God did manifest, by the course of his providence towards them, what hee did require and deserve at their hands, namely, that they should humble themselves to walke with the Lord their God; and the phrase, *to humble thee*, applyed even to the most carnall, may have a faire construction, *that thou shouldst be humbled*, or, *humble thy selfe*, understanding it *ex officio*; for hereby hee did manifest that this was their duty, answerable to Gods proceedings with them: and yet further, considering that hee representeth his owne gracious proceedings with them, by the proceedings of an earthly father with his children, Verse 5. *Know therefore in thine heart, that as a man nurtureth his sonne, so the Lord thy God nurtureth thee*; no marvell if he expresseth his affections and desires towards them, suteable to the desires and affections of an earthly father, who being not able effectually to procure their amendment, yet desires it. And this is Gods usuall course, to expresse himselfe in such language, *per anthropopathian*. But, shall wee hereupon take liberty to build doctrines, as touching

ing

ing the nature of God, as if that which is figuratively uttered were properly delivered? Hee proved them all, I confesse, and upon the probation some proved good silver, and others no better than drosse; and thereupon hee did good to the one in their latter end, and not unto the other: Neither did hee ever purpose, that good in their latter end should redound unto any, but as they should be humbled: wherein, humiliation is made the condition of doing them good, not of Gods purpose or intention: And withall, God gave unto those that were truly mortified, that is, truly humbled, *hearts to perceive, eyes to see, and eares to heare*; but hee gave not the like grace unto all. And looke what is said of Gods intention to humble them, the same may be said of Gods intention to purge them, according to that *Ezek.* 24. 13. *Because I would have purged thee, and thou wast not purged, thou shalt not bee purged from thy filthinesse, till I have caused my wrath to light upon thee*: I would have purged thee, *voluntate præcepti*, represented by the meanes used in his word; which failing, hee resolveth to take another course, even by judgements in his works, meaning to goe on in avenging the quarrell of his Covenant, *Levit.* 26.25. *untill their uncircumcised hearts were humbled*, Levit. 26.41. purposing so at length to effect it; as hee professeth, *Ezek.* 22.15. saying, *I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the countries, and will cause thy filthinesse to cease from thee.* Yet this is not so much by the power of afflictions, as by the power of his Spirit, *Esay* 57. 17. *For his wicked covetousnesse I was angry with him, and have smitten him: I hid me, and was angry; yet hee went away and turned after the way of his heart: I have seen his wayes, and I will heal them.* But, when these ends are not attained, God complaines (you say) *He had used these meanes in vaine.* Indeed, *Jer.* 2. 20. hee saith, *Of old have I broken thy yoke, and burst thy bonds, and thou saidst, I will no more transgresse; but, like an harlot, thou runnest on all high hills, and under every green tree.* But this is rather a conviction of their unfaithfulnesse, in not keeping Covenant with him, than a complaint: But be it a complaint, as such complaints are attributed unto God, like as men complaine when they cannot help; but take heed wee doe not here-hence inferre, that God is like man, not able to prevent crosse events contrary to his expectation. Neither doth hee there say, *Hee had used those*

meanes in vaine; for, before hee uſed them, he knew at leaſt (you will not deny it) what would be the iſſue; and no wiſe man, I think, will ſet himſelfe to doe that which hee knowes will prove vaine, in reſpect of the end intended by him. But *Jer.*10.30. the Lord ſaith thus, *I have ſmitten your children in vaine, they have received no correction*; and this plainly argueth (as you ſay) his firſt and chiefeſt intent was to heale, and not to harden. It is true, upon a ſuperficiall ſcanning of the place, it ſeemeth that God intended to heale them; but of any compariſon made between two ends intended, the one chiefly, the other ſecondarily, not the leaſt glympſe of evidence. But I deny that hee intended healing at all in this caſe; for, if hee did, that being his owne worke, why did hee not heale them? Will you ſay, Becauſe they would not receive inſtruction, but went after the way of their own hearts ſtill? This is a vaine anſwer; for this is no impediment unto God; as I prove firſt by cleare evidence of Scripture, *Eſay* 57.17. *I have ſmitten him, and yet hee went after the way of his heart*; nevertheleſſe mark what followes, *I have ſeen his wayes, and I will heal them.* Secondly, by cleare demonſtration of reaſon; to heale them, is to bring them to repentance: Now, will you ſay that God is ready to performe this, provided that they doe repent? If they repent already, what need is there of Gods grace to bring them to repentance? and what is it to prerequire repentance on mans part, to this end that God may give them repentance? as if man muſt firſt repent, and then God will give him repentance. But ſome will ſay, What then is the meaning of the Lord, ſaying, *I have ſmitten your children in vaine, they have received no correction?* I anſwer, we are to conceive Gods corrections to tend to this, according to that of *Peter, knowing that the long-ſuffering of the Lord is ſalvation:* or, God ſpeakes this, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, after the manner of earthly parents, ſeeking their childrens amendment by correction, but not obtaining it. And this being an end of correction in Gods children; in the wicked this end is not obtained. And what difference is there between meanes naturall and meanes morall, but this, meanes naturall have power to effect their ends, meanes morall are to admoniſh morall agents of their duty to doe this or that? and ſo the ends of Gods puniſhment is, that by them wee ſhould learne to amend our lives; as is ſignified in the Collects of our Church. In a word, naturall means tend

to

to ends that ſhall be thereupon; morall means tend to ends that ſhould be; and each are uſually ſaid to be in vaine, when the end, according to each kind, is not obtained. God ſent his Sonne into the world, not that hee ſhould condemne the world, but that the world ſhould be ſaved by him. Moſt true; for hee ſent his Son into the world, to dye for the world; and to dye for them is to ſave them, and not to condemne them. But, for whom did hee ſend his Sonne into the world, to dye? Surely, for the world of Elect; even for thoſe whom God the Father had given him: *Thou haſt given him power over all fleſh, that hee ſhould give eternall life to all them that thou haſt given him*, Joh. 17. 2. And if wee conſider the world, in diſtinction from thoſe whom God hath given him, hee plainly profeſſeth, that as hee did *not pray for them*, Joh. 17. 9. ſo hee did not *ſanctifie himſelfe for them*, Verſe 19. that is, offer himſelfe up upon the Croſſe; as *Maldonate* acknowledgeth to be the joynt interpretation of all the Fathers whom hee had read: And your ſelfe have but earſt confeſſed, that *God did not* (Joh. 3.17.) *give the world unto Chriſt, by him of grace to be bought (or brought) unto ſalvation.* Undoubtedly, hee ſent not Chriſt into the world at all to procure any mans condemnation: neither doth Chriſt procure any mans condemnation; although infidelity and diſobedience to the word of Chriſt procures the condemnation of many. And I wonder what moved you ſo to ſpeake, as to imply it was Gods intent (though not chiefe intent) to ſend Chriſt into the world to procure the condemnation of any. At length wee are come to the ἀκμὴ of the point controverted between us, in the words following; *If they ſhould plead their condemnation to be unjuſt, for unbeleefe, becauſe they were not able to beleeve*, Ver. 18. our Saviour anſwers by a reaſonable prevention, *ver. 19. This is their condemnation*, viz. *the juſt cauſe of their condemnation, that when light came into the world, men loved darkneſſe rather than light; men choſe rather to cleave to their ſinfull eſtates, and wayes of darkneſſe, than to follow the light of the means of grace, which might have brought them on to beleeve in Chriſt.* Firſt, let us conſider the Text it ſelfe, then your interpretation and accommodation thereof. Our Saviour doth plainly derive the cauſe of their unbeleefe, or diſapprobation of the Goſpel, ſignified in theſe words, *They loved darkneſſe rather than light*; I ſay, the

cauſe of this our Saviour referres to their workes of darkneſſe, expreſſed in theſe words, *Becauſe their deeds were evill.* The full meaning whereof, I take to be this; The workes wherein they delight are evill; that is, workes of darkneſſe; and therefore no marvell if they hate the light, and preferre darkneſſe before it:

—Pulchra Laverna, Da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumq; videri.
Noctem peccatis, & fraudibus objice nubem.

But give mee leave to make an honeſt motion: As it becomes us to take notice of this cauſe mentioned here, ſo it becomes us nothing leſſe to take notice of other cauſes mentioned in other places. Now, another cauſe of unbeleefe is mentioned *Joh.*5.44. and that of the ſame generall nature with this, but expreſſed in more ſpeciall manner by our Saviour, thus, *How can yee beleeve, which receive honour one of another, and ſeeke not the honour that cometh from God onely?* Yet this is not all the cauſe of unbeleefe which the Scripture commends unto us; for the Apoſtle alſo takes notice of Sathans illuſions, in this worke of unbeleefe, 2 *Cor.*4.3, 4. *If our Goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt: Whoſe eyes the God of this world hath blinded, &c.* And becauſe it is in the power of God to correct this delight wee take in evill workes, and to deliver us from the illuſions of Sathan, if it pleaſe him to ſhew ſuch mercy towards us; and when he doth not, he is ſaid to harden us; The hand of God in this our Saviour takes notice of, as the cauſe of unbeleefe in man, *Joh.*12.39, 40. *Therefore they could not beleeve, becauſe* Eſaias *ſaith againe, Hee hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they ſhould not ſee with their eyes, and underſtand with their heart, and be converted, and I ſhould heale them.* Like as *Moſes* of old told the Jewes, ſaying, *Deut.*29.2,3. *Yee have ſeen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of* Egypt *unto* Pharaoh, *and unto all his ſervants, and unto all his land: The great temptations which thine eyes have ſeen, the ſignes, and thoſe great miracles:* Ver. 4. *Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to ſee, and eares to heare, unto this day.* And this hee doth even then when his purpoſe was to reprove them for their naturall incorrigibleneſſe; for men ſinne never the leſſe obſtinately, becauſe God denyes them grace, but rather ſo much the more obſtinately; becauſe (as *Auſtin* well ſaith) *Libertas ſine gratia non eſt libertas, ſed contumacia:* and, conſequently, they are never a whit the leſſe faulty, though

though it be not in their power to correct that corruption of their hearts, whence this faultineſſe proceeds. And hereupon the Apoſtle gives way to the ſame objection, in effect, which you propoſe; for, having concluded that *God hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardeneth*, hee gives place to ſuch an objection; *Thou wilt ſay then, Why doth hee yet complaine? for who hath reſiſted his will?* and anſwers it not as our Saviour doth; for our Saviour propoſed no ſuch objection to be anſwered, as you feigne the Apoſtle doth plainly, and in expreſſe termes. Our Saviour diſcovers the immediate cauſe of unbeleefe, to wit, becauſe *their hearts were ſet on evill*; as it was ſometimes with the *Coloſſians*, *Col.*1.21. yet becauſe it was not in their power to change their hearts, but God alone; who will change them, through mercy, in whom hee will; and will not change them in others, but harden them. Hereupon the Apoſtle gives way to an objection, in a matter more ſublime than yours, as before mentioned, and anſwers it in this manner, *O man, who art thou that diſputeſt with God? Shall the thing formed ſay to him that formed it, Why haſt thou made mee thus? Hath not the Potter power, &c.* which is an anſwer to ſuch a queſtion as this, Why doth God complaine of us for that which proceeds from the hardneſſe of our hearts, which God alone can cure, but will not; but rather, by denying us mercy, continues to harden us?

But now, let us conſider the interpretation and accommodation of this place, to the plea deviſed by you: The reaſon, you ſay, why *men loved darkneſſe rather than light*, is, *becauſe men choſe rather to cleave to their ſinfull eſtates, and wayes of darkneſſe, than to follow the light of the meanes of grace, which might have brought them on to beleeve in Chriſt.* It is great pity that by our owne phraſiologies wee ſhould raiſe unto our ſelves a miſt, whereby wee ſhould be the more unable to diſcerne the truth of God. Suppoſe the Paraphraſe were both found in it ſelfe, and congruous to the Text; yet give way, I pray, to ſuch a queſtion in the ſecond place, What was the reaſon that they *choſe rather to cleave to their ſinfull eſtates, and wayes of darkneſſe, than to follow the light of the meanes of grace?* If you anſwer any thing but that of our Saviour, *Joh.*12.39. *Therefore they could not beleeve, becauſe* Eſaias *ſaith againe, Hee hath blinded their eyes, and hardned their heart, that they ſhould not ſee with their eyes, nor under-*

ſtand

ſtand with their heart, and ſhould be converted, and I ſhould heal them; I will not ceaſe to purſue you, untill you come to this; and withall, put you to give a reaſon, why you ſhould not take hold of this anſwer of our Saviour *Joh.*12.39. as of that *Joh.*3. 19. eſpecially, conſidering that if a queſtion were moved, Why ſome *choſe rather to follow the light of the meanes of grace, than to cleave to their ſinfull eſtates, and wayes of darkneſſe?* I doubt not but you would forthwith anſwer, Becauſe God had mercy on them, and gave them hearts to know Chriſt, and to beleeve in him, 1 *Joh.*5.20. *Phil.*1.29. And ſeeing God doth not ſhew the like favour to others, to ſhew them the like mercy, which is, in Scripture phraſe, to harden, *Rom.*9.18. and *Rom.*11.7. or, not to give hearts to perceive, and eyes to ſee, and eares to heare, *Deut.*29.4. why ſhould wee not ſay plainly, that whereas the one takes a right way, it is becauſe God ſhewes mercy towards them, to give them ſo much grace; and whereas the other takes not the right, but the wrong way, it is becauſe God hardens them, in denying the like mercy and grace to them? like as our Saviour expreſly ſignifieth alſo, *Joh.*8.47. *Hee that is of God heareth Gods words; yee therefore heare them not, becauſe yee are not of God.* But if any man ſhall inquire, What then moved our Saviour to give this reaſon *why men loved darkneſſe rather than light*, to wit, this, *becauſe their deeds were evill?* I anſwer, hee gives the immediate cauſe why they loved not the light; that is, they had no mind to heare the doctrine of our Saviour: and that was, in reſpect of the convincing nature of it, and therein, like unto light, which makes every thing to appeare and be manifeſt, according to its proper hiew; whereas in darkneſſe all things are confounded; according to that *Epheſ.*5.13.

Now they who brought ill conſciences along with them, no marvell if they were quickly weary of our Saviours company: A pregnant example whereof wee have *Joh.*8.7. For when our Saviour ſaid unto them who brought unto him a woman taken in adultery, *Let him that is among you without ſinne caſt the firſt ſtone at her.* Ver. 9. *When they heard this, being accuſed by their owne conſcience, they went out one by one, beginning at the eldeſt, even to the laſt.* So that, indeed, the reaſon given by our Saviour *Joh.*3.19. is not ſo much a reaſon why they beleeved not, as why they liked not to heare him. Many did endure the hearing of him,

yet

yet were not brought to beleeve in him. *Auſtin* ſometimes propoſed ſuch a queſtion as this; Why doe not men doe this or that? As for example, Why doe they not *facere quod juſtum eſt?* and hee anſwers, *Quia nolunt.* But if you aske mee, *Quare nolunt?* *Imus in longum,* ſaith *Auſtin.* Yet, *ſine prejudicio diligentioris inquiſitionis,* hee takes upon him to anſwer it thus, *Vel quia latet, vel quia non delectat.* But marke what hee brings in upon the back of this; *Sed ut innoteſcat quod latebat, & ſuave fiat quod minime delectabat, gratia Dei eſt quæ hominum adjuvat voluntates.* But the face of your diſcourſe tends to this, as if you were of opinion, that every naturall man hath ſo ſufficient grace, as to chooſe to follow the light of the meanes of grace, rather than to cleave to his ſinfull eſtate, and wayes of darkneſſe: and that not onely if hee will, for if hee will, the greateſt part of the worke is done already; but that his will is indifferently of it ſelf inclinable to the one as well as to the other: which is ſo dangerous an opinion, and ſo oppoſite to the doctrine of Gods word, repreſenting the miſerable corruption of mans heart, and the peculiar power of Gods regenerating grace, that you are loath to breake out in plaine termes to profeſſe as much. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *The light of the meanes of grace, had it been followed, might have brought them to beleeve in Chriſt*; You will not ſay, upon the following hereof they had been brought, but they might have beene brought to beleeve. By following the light of the meanes of grace, I underſtand a continuing to heare the word of God: Now, it is well knowne that many, nay moſt, in all probability, though they continue all their dayes to be hearers; yet, as the Apoſtle ſpeakes of ſome, ſo may wee ſay of them, *They are ever learning, and never come to the knowledge*, at leaſt to any ſaving knowledge, *of the truth.* On the contrary, *Saul* perſecuting the Church of God, even in the way, marching furiouſly, *Jehu* like, againſt the Profeſſors of the Goſpel, it pleaſed God to call him, and convert him. Wee know, ſaith *Auſtin*, that God hath converted the wills of men, not onely *averſas à vera fide, ſed & adverſas veræ fidei.* So that even oppoſition to grace God can cure, if it pleaſe him; and regenerate a man to bring him to faith and repentance, if it pleaſe him; and if hee doth not, certainly the reaſons can be no other, then becauſe hee will not; and that to his owne glorious ends, which is reaſon enough for the

Creator may doe what hee will; his Wisdome in referring all to congruous ends, being his Justice; as *Aquinas* acknowledgeth. Christ was willing and earnest to gather Jerusalem under his wings; and no marvell, hee was bound to doe all hee could, as the Minister of Circumcision, to save his brethren; for hee was made under the Law, and was bound to love not onely his brethren, but his enemies also, as well as wee are bound to shew the like love to all: But to inferre here-hence, that therefore it was the will of God to have healed and saved that part of *Jerusalem* that would not, is a liberty which affection to a cause may take, but no reason doth justifie it. Like as our Saviour in his ministery, so the Prophets in theirs, desired to doe as much good as they could to all: but here-hence it followeth not, that it was the will of God to convert all whom the Prophets desired to convert. And as our Saviour by his teares, so the Prophets by
Jer. 13. 17. their teares, did manifest their desire to bring them to repentance, to doe the uttermost of their power to bring them hereunto: but will you inferre here-hence, that God also did desire to bring them to repentance? As for the phrase of *carrying thoughts of peace towards them*, that is generall, and therefore ambiguous; and to what specialty you doe referre it, I know not: Yet, according to the Scripture sense thereof, it is nothing correspondent to your opinion. For Gods thoughts of peace, in Scripture phrase, towards his people, consist not onely in affording meanes, but in making them effectuall also to the procuring of such a gracious disposition in his people, as to make them fit for the mercies which God hath resolved to conferre upon them; as *Jer.* 29. 10. *But thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at* Babel, *I will visit you, and performe my good promise towards you, and cause you to returne to this place.* Verse 11. *For I know the thoughts that I have thought towards you, saith the Lord, even thoughts of peace, and not of trouble, to give you an end, and your hope.* Verse 12. *Then shall yee cry unto mee, and yee shall goe and pray unto me, and I will hearke you.* Ver. 13. *And yee shall seek me, and find me, because yee shall seek me with all your heart.* Ver. 14. *And I will be found of you, saith the Lord, and I will turne your captivity.* And as for the former phrase, in saying, *It was the will of God to have healed them*: In proportion to the place now alledged out of *Jeremy*, it may be granted

granted, that God would have healed them; to wit, in case they would have converted unto God with all their heart, and with all their soule; as our Saviour signifies, *Joh.* 12. 40. and that out of *Esay* 6. and like as God himselfe expresly professeth, *Deut.* 4. 29. *If from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thine heart, and with all thy soule.* But is it, thinke you, in any unregenerate mans power *to seek God with all their heart, and with all their soule?* I thinke this is no more in the power of a man unregenerate, than it is in his power *to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soule*: Now this is expresly attributed to the circumcision of the heart wrought by God, *Deut.* 30.6. When you adde, that *the will of God is, the world of unbeleevers shall not be shut out from Christ, if they shut not out themselves through unbeleefe*: This assertion of yours is such as no man, that I know, denyes: And it is as true of the Elect as of the Reprobate; namely, that they should be utterly shut out of Christ, if they should shut out themselves by finall unbeleefe; for, undoubtedly, the word of God is true, that saith, *Whosoever beleeveth, shall be saved; whosoever beleeveth not, shall be damned.* But lest we should seeme to be pleased with our owne errors, let us speake distinctly, and keep our selves from confusion: *To be shut out of Christ*, is, to be shut off from some benefit that is to be obtained by Christ. Now, if wee speake of the benefit of forgiveneſſe of sinnes, and of salvation; the truth is plaine and distinct, that no man is bereaved of salvation and forgiveness of sinnes by Christ, but through unbeleefe; and whosoever beleeveth not, is excluded from pardon and salvation by Christ. But is there no other benefit wee obtaine by Christ, besides forgiveneſſe of sinnes and salvation? What thinke you of the gift of faith and repentance? are not those spirituall blessings which wee obtaine in Christ, and for Christs sake? *Ephes.* 1.3. If it be so, I pray consider, is it handsome to say, that none is shut off from the gift of faith, but through unbeleefe? Certainly, unbeleefe is no tolerable cause why God should deny them the gift of faith, seeing all are in unbeleefe till God bestowes upon them the gift of faith; neither can it be expected a man should beleeve, till God gives him the gift of faith, if so be faith be indeed the gift of God, and not the work of mans free-will without any gift of God. As for your discourse, though it

it tends to a conclusion, which, rightly understood, no man denyes in one sense; nor will any wise man affirme in another sense: I thinke fit to consider that also. *The Spirit*, you say, *convinceth the world of sinne, because they beleeved not in Christ; but the Spirit of God moveth to nothing, but what hee knoweth to be according to the will of God.* Let all this be granted; yet nothing followeth here-hence but that it was the will of God that the world should be convinced of sinne, in not beleeving in Christ; which no intelligent man will deny. But yet, by your leave, it is no good consequence to inferre here-hence, that, therefore it is the will of God that the world of unbeleevers shall not be shut out from Christ, if they shut not out themselves by unbeleefe. Therefore, we grant both the antecedent and the consequent: yet, by the way, as touching that which you affirme, that *God sent his Spirit to convince the world of sinne, because they beleeve not in Christ*; this is a truth, wee confesse; but, perhaps, wee may be to seeke of the right accommodation hereof: for, where is the world convinced of sinne, in not beleeving in Christ? or, to whom? I grant, to all beleevers the world of unbeleevers is by the Spirit of God convinced of sinne, in not beleeving in Christ; but are they convinced hereof to themselves, and in their owne consciences? I grant this also, as often as it pleaseth God to convert them by the power of his Spirit; then they are convicted of the sinfull nature of their owne unbeleefe: Yet be it granted, that an unbeleever continuing in unbeleefe may be, and is, sometimes convicted of the sinfull nature of his unbeleefe; because the Apostle saith of an heretique, that hee is αὐτοκατάκριτος· yet, that is not till after one and another admonition: nevertheless, this makes nothing for you, unlesse you maintain that Gods Spirit convicts them also of this, that it is in their power to beleeve; which power of beleeving you seeme to attribute to a man unregenerate, though you are loath to speake plainly, in expressing so much. And you seem to intimate such an Argument as this; *They sinne in not beleeving; therefore it is in their power to beleeve*: But you may as well inferre, that wee sinne in not keeping Gods Law; therefore it is in our power to keep it. Or, if you dispute thus, The world is convicted of sinne in not beleeving; therefore they have power to beleeve: You may as well dispute thus; The regenerate are convicted that they sinne, in that their flesh lusteth

against

against the Spirit; therefore it is in their power to keep the flesh from lusting against the Spirit.

Answ. *Besides, when men quench the motions of the Spirit, and persecute the Ministers of the word, how can they be said, in so doing, to resist the Holy Ghost, if the Holy Ghost went not about such a worke, as to bring them to Christ, and to life by him? Could they be said to resist the Holy Ghost, if the workes of the Holy Ghost had never striven with them to worke this worke in them? Thus then you see, those three that beare witnesse in heaven, the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, they all from heaven beare witnesse of this point in hand, concerning the truth hereof: The Father, by the end of the creation of his workes and providence; the Sonne, by his end of enlightening the world, and of his coming into it to dye for it; the Holy Ghost, by his inward wrestling in the hearts of men, doe all of them really proclaime, that it is the will and good pleasure of God, as to save the Elect, not according to their owne workes, but his grace; so likewise to save the world of mankind, if their workes hinder not his good will towards them. Thus you see also a sweet harmony between the Purpose, and the Covenant or Promise, and the Providence of God: This Purpose willeth life unto the world, upon the condition of their obedience and repentance: the Promise, in the Covenant of Workes, offereth life unto them likewise upon the same condition: the Providence of God the Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, provideth and applieth severall meanes of life unto the world, upon the same tearmes. And there is in every godly man, renewed after the Image of God, a just concord betwixt his Purpose, his Covenant or Promise, and his Performance: So is there here the like in God. You may read what Gods purpose is toward the world, by his Covenant made with the world; and you may see both what his Covenant with them, and purpose of them is, by his performance and execution of them both, in his actuall providence, in the fulnesse of time. If you ask how God may be said to purpose any thing that is not effectually accomplished? I answer, the act of Gods will, which hee is pleased to put forth, is alwayes accomplished: There is no good thing possible to be, though it never come to passe, (as that all men should in all things obey the word of God) but God passeth upon it some act of his will; hee at least approveth it to be good, and good it is, though it never come to passe: This act is not disappointed; for*

as hee will prove it, so likewise doth hee approve it. Doth God command this or that good duty to be done, which is not done? Yet that act of his will which hee puts forth is done: as hee willed to command it, so hee did command it. Doth God purpose to give life to the world upon condition of obedience, and accordingly give means to help them to the performance of this obedience, so farre as it is meet for them to doe? Surely God performeth it on his part, although men performe it not on their part: their salvation is indeed disappointed, but not Gods will; who never willed to give salvation to them, but upon that condition.

Examin. The motions of the Spirit which are quenched, are godly motions, in the way of admonition, perswasion, exhortation; and they are quenched not onely in the men of the world, but too often in the children of God; the flesh too often prevailing in their lustings against the spirit, whereby are quenched for a time the motions of the Spirit; that is, the regenerate part lusting against the flesh; and consequently, the motions also of the Spirit of God admonishing and inviting unto good, either by the hearing of the word, or by the observation of Gods works. This worke of morall motion and invitation is wrought sometimes with a purpose to worke obedience conformable thereunto; sometimes with no such purpose; as often as God doth not make them effectuall to the working of obedience, whether in the unregenerate or regenerate, for even these sometimes (yea, too oft) erre from Gods wayes, and have their hearts hardened against his feare: for, if God had a purpose to make them effectuall, who should hinder him? *Who hath resisted his will? cui nullum humanum resistit arbitrium* (saith *Austin*;) for, *ex nolentibus volentes facit*. Undoubtedly, morall invitations, if they be not yeelded unto, are justly said to be resisted, to what end soever they be made, whether to convert them, or to leave them without excuse; even such an excuse as *Austin* speaks of, when hee saith, *Dicere solet humana superbia, Si scissem, fecissem.* I see no reason why you should deny the Elect to be saved according to their workes; our Saviour doth manifest, *Mat.* 25. that they are so: *Come yee blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdome prepared for you, &c. For I was an hungred, and you fed mee, &c.* and can it be denyed, but that God rewardeth every man according to his workes? *I have* 2 Tim. 4. *fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith,*

faith, saith *Paul*; *Henceforth there is laid up for mee a crowne of righteousnesse. God is not unrighteous, to forget the labour of your love, &c. Looke to your selves*, saith *John*, that *wee may not lose the things that wee have done, but wee may receive a full reward.* *Piscator*, a precise Divine, spareth not to professe, that *fides* is *causa salutis*: They are not, I confesse, *causa meritoria*, as sinne is *causa damnationis*; but they are *causa dispositive*, according to the Apostles phrase, *God hath made us meet partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light.* Neither doe I see any reason why you should oppose grace and good workes, in the point of salvation, howsoever they are opposed in the point of justification: The place you point unto for proofe, treats not of the salvation of glory, but of the salvation of grace, consisting in effectuall calling; as the Text it selfe manifesteth. Had you spoken plainly, as you might, and as sometimes you doe, even in this Section, more than once; as when you say, *Gods Purpose willeth life to the world, upon the condition of their obedience and repentance*, it would manifestly appeare, that there was no reason to distinguish the Elect from the Reprobate, in this Purpose of God, seeing it equally passeth upon them both. For, undoubtedly, Gods Purpose is not to give the Elect life, but upon condition of their obedience and repentance. And likewise, his Purpose was to condemne all, one as well as another, upon the condition of their disobedience and unrepentance. But, had you dealt thus plainly, then you would be driven to acknowledge another decree, which alone puts the difference between the Elect and the Reprobate; and that is, the decree of God to shew mercy, in giving the grace of obedience and repentance unto the one; and of hardening, in denying the grace of obedience and repentance unto the other. But this plaine-dealing had utterly marred the state of your present discourse, in this particular. Yet, to touch something by the way; How, I pray, doth God the Father, by the end of the Creation of his workes and Providence, beare witnesse to this Point, that it is the will and good pleasure of God to save the Elect, not according to their owne workes, but his grace? Secondly, if God the Sonne died for the whole world, Reprobate and Elect, how doth this testifie that onely a few, called the Elect, should be saved by Gods grace? Is there any greater grace than the grace of Redemption by the bloud of Christ, which is both of a satisfactory

1 Thes. 1.

2 Tim. 1. 9.

ry nature for all sinne, and of a meritorious nature to purchase all grace and all glory? And shall not God deale with Christ according to the exigence of his merits and satisfactions? whether they were meritorious and satisfactory so farre of their owne nature, or by the constitution of God, all is one. Last of all, as touching the motions of the Spirit, if they are no other then morall invitations, they tend to no other end then to bring all men alike unto salvation, in case they are obeyed; and to expose all alike unto condemnation, in case they are disobeyed. If wee speake of other motions making the former effectuall unto obedience and repentance, these being found onely in the Elect, are documents of Gods will and purpose to save them to whom they are granted; and as manifest a document, that Gods will and purpose is not to save them to whom they are denyed.

As for the harmony you speake of, between Gods Purpose and Covenant, herein is your error two-fold: First, in that you apply this wholly to the world, to Reprobates; whereas it concernes, as I have shewed, the Elect as well as the Reprobate; the reason whereof is, because it respects onely the collating of salvation, and inflicting of condemnation, which have their course upon condition. But there is another worke of Gods Providence, concerning the giving or denying of grace for performing the condition of life: And this worke is not performed upon any condition, but meerly according to the good pleasure of God, in shewing mercy to whom hee will, and hardening whom he will. And the Purpose of God for the execution of these is clearly absolute, without all colour of condition. And whereas you conceive this Purpose of God, thus absolute, concernes onely the Elect, that is your second error: For, God doth not more absolutely grant the gift of obedience and repentance unto his Elect, than hee doth deny it unto Reprobates; as I doubt not but will be made clearly to appeare, if you should come to a Collation hereabout. But I doe not thinke you have any purpose to deale upon this, but carry your selfe in a way of your owne, not exactly considered, wherein confusion, of things that are to be distinguished, doth afford you the best service. As for the third, which this harmony you speake of comprehends, to wit, the Providence of God, I left that out, because you shape to your selfe such a Providence of God, as whereby God did provide for all men, in all ages, sufficien-

ficient meanes of grace, to bring them to obedience and repentance: which ſeemes to be the opinion of the Author who wrote the two bookes *De vocatione Gentium*. For the juſtification of which conceit, though *Arminians* now-adayes relye much upon that Author, in this particular, I freely confeſſe, I know no reaſon, nor colour of reaſon. As for the compariſon you make betweene a godly regenerate man and God, you might as well have ſhaped it betweene many an honeſt heathen man and God. But you conſider not a moſt momentous difference; man purpoſeth to doe things upon conditions, the performance or not performance whereof he is not able to fore-ſee, much leſſe able to diſpoſe of efficacy to performe the condition to whom hee will, and to deny it to whom hee will; all which is incident unto God, and caſts us neceſſarily upon the acknowledgement of an abſolute Purpoſe in God to performe this, as hee thinkes good; which is not to be found in man. Againe, you conceive this Purpoſe and Covenant of God to be made onely with the world, who will never performe it: Man enters upon no ſuch Purpoſes and Covenants; but rather ſuch, the conditions whereof are as ſoon performed as not performed. And I wonder you ſhould ſwallow this compariſon, as exact, not conſidering the foule diſproportion that is found therein between God and man: But affection to our owne opinion, I confeſſe, is apt to abuſe us, and make us take notice onely of that which makes for us, not of that which makes much more againſt us.

As for the Objection here inſerted, in the Anſwer whereunto, you trouble your ſelfe not a little, you might well have ſpared your paines, and anſwered in briefe, that though it were very ſtrange that any thing ſhould not be accompliſhed which God doth will abſolutely; yet, ſurely, it is nothing ſtrange, that that ſhould not be accompliſhed which God doth will to come to paſſe onely upon a condition; for, the condition failing, there is no reaſon why wee ſhould expect the accompliſhment thereof. And ſuch is the will of God which here you propoſe concerning the world, namely, in willing that they ſhall be ſaved, on condition of their obedience and repentance; damned, in caſe of their diſobedience and impenitency. Yet, it is not amiſſe to conſider what you let fall in your Anſwer, to an Objection very needleſſe, and which no wiſe man, amongſt them who are adverſe to you in this opinion, would

frame; *That act of Gods will* (you say) *which it pleaseth God to put forth, is alwayes accomplished*: I demand then, as touching this will of God whereby hee wills life to the world upon their obedience and repentance, whether it be accomplished or no? If it be, then it is accomplished in their condemnation; for, certainly, it is not accomplished in their salvation. And to this effect, I presume, tends your answer in the next Section. That which followes, when you say, *There is no good thing possible to be, though it never come to passe, (as that all men in all things should obey the word of God) but that God passeth upon it some act of his will*; This, I say, is nothing to the purpose; and that for two reasons: First, because it proceeds of morall good; whereas the objects arising from the consideration of God willing salvation to the world, upon their obedience and repentance, had not its course of good morall, which is mans duty; but of some good naturall, which he should receive by way of reward. Secondly, accomplishment of a thing willed, consists not in the approving of it, but in bringing of it to passe; as all men know, by common notion. When as you say, as touching *Bonum*, that *God as hee will prove it, so hee doth approve it*; as if approving of it were for the present, and proving of it were for the time to come, is so wilde an expression, that I cannot comprehend it. Wee use by proving a thing, to approve it as good; and not first approve it, and then prove it. As little to the purpose is that which followeth, as when you say, *When God commands a duty, his will of command is accomplished*: But, whereas God is said to will the thing that hee commands, here ariseth a question, how that can be said to be willed by God, which most commonly is not accomplished? For, albeit the will of command is accomplished, by the commanding of this or that, yet Gods will of the thing commanded seemes not to be accomplished, unlesse the thing willed by God be sometimes brought to passe. The truth is, your opinion seemes to be, That God not onely willeth the salvation of the world, upon the condition of their repentance, (for that is no more to will their salvation, than their damnation) but that God willeth and desireth their salvation absolutely, in as much as hee willeth and desireth their repentance. I confesse you doe not in expresse termes professe as much; namely, that God willeth and desireth the repentance of Reprobates; yet hitherto you seeme to tend, in this discourse of yours, though concerning

this

this you say no more than this, *That God gives meanes to help them to the performance of this obedience, so farre as is meet for him:* which while you professe, I doubt you understand not your owne meaning; and therefore no marvell if others doe not understand it: For, how farre he doth help them, you expresse in a very uncertaine manner; which is rather to conceale, than to discover and expresse your meaning. But I will endeavour to bolt it out. These meanes you speake of are either morall onely, consisting in instructing them wherein this obedience doth consist, and urging them by perswasion thereunto; or, in affording, besides this, some efficacious operation of Gods Spirit, to worke them to this obedience. Now, this latter cannot be your meaning; for if this were afforded them, their obedience, certainly, would be wrought: but the world, of whom you speake, doe never perform this obedience. Now, in granting the other, there is not so much evidence of Gods will that they shall performe this obedience, as by the denying of this wee have evidence, that his will is not that they shall performe this obedience. Againe, in respect of meanes morall, can any be saved without the meanes of true faith and true repentance? I thinke you will not say they can: Then consider, have all men sufficient instruction unto the performance of true faith and true repentance? How will you be able to make this good? Hand over head, you say, *God gives meanes to help them to the performance of this obedience, so farre as is meet for him to doe:* yet, I am perswaded, you are not able to make this good, taking it according to the confuse generality wherein you expresse it. For, is it not meet for God to afford any Nation or particular persons his word and Gospel, as well as it is meet for him to afford it us? Nay, is it not as meet for God to afford any other person both the outward meanes, and the inward efficacious operation of his holy Spirit, to worke them unto faith and true repentance, as well as by these meanes hee hath been pleased to worke us hereunto? This meetnesse, what is it but that which Schoolmen call, *Justitia condecentia*, and which they professe doth accompany every action of God? So that had God afforded the same grace to others which hee hath afforded unto us, hee had carried himselfe therein meetly, that is, justly, *justitia condecentia*. Againe, had hee denyed the same grace to us which hee hath denyed unto others, he had herein also carried himselfe meetly, or

decently, that is, justly, *justitia condecentia.* I am sorry to observe from such good mens pens such illusions to have their course, to the obscuring of the grace of God, and his soveraignty of dispensing it to whom hee will. This very ayre I find breathed forth in the writings of others, and it seemes to mee very probable, that they have derived it from hence.

Answ. *Besides, to cleare this point more fully, the will of God towards the world is put forth in a disjunct axiome*; viz. *either to give life unto the world, upon the condition of their obedience*; *or to inflict death, upon the condition of their disobedience. Now, as in a disjunct axiome the whole proportion is true, if either part be true*; *so the will put forth in a disjunct axiome is alwayes accomplished, if either act be accomplished.*

But if it be objected, how may it appeare this will of God to give life to the world, upon condition of their obedience, is serious and not pretended; *since if hee would hee is able to give them such hearts as would cause them to obey him?*

I answer; *That God willeth it seriously, appeares manifestly by the declaration of his will already mentioned*; viz. *his Oath, his Covenant, yea, and the workes of each Person in the Trinity, tending to this end, to give life to the world: all which it were blasphemy to thinke they were not done seriously. Doth the living God sweare, and not sweare in earnest? God forbid. Doth God enter into Covenant with his creature, and intend no performance of promise according to his Covenant? farre be it from the just and holy God to doe it, and from us to imagine it. Shall we think each Person in the Trinity slighteth the worke of the salvation of mankind, because mankind slighteth to worke out their salvation with the Trinity?*

But, besides the declaration of Gods will, thus seriously expressed, I produce the teares of our Saviour over Jerusalem, *lamenting their careleſse neglect of the day of their peace: which argued, not onely in Christ as man, a serious compassion of their affected ignorance and misery*; *but also, as God, a tender consideration of their peace, and of providing the meanes for it. Moreover, what shall wee thinke of those passionate exclamations? Oh, that there were in this people an heart to feare mee, and to keep my commandements alwayes, that it may goe well with them, and with their children for ever! Oh, that they were wise, that they*

under-

understood this, that they would consider their latter end! Oh, that my people had hearkened unto mee, and that Israel had walked in my wayes! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries. *Do not all these speeches expresse an earnest and serious affection in God, as concerning the conversion and salvation of this people, whereof sundry died in their sinnes? It is true, God might have given them such hearts as to have feared and obeyed him; which though hee did not, yet his will that they had such hearts was serious still. To cleare it by a comparison: The father of the family hath both his son and servant dangerously sick of the stone; to heale them both, the father useth sundry medicines, even all that art prescribeth, except cutting: when hee seeth no other remedy, he perswades them both to suffer cutting, to save their lives: they both refuse it; yet his sonne hee taketh, and bindeth him hand and foot, and causeth him to endure it, and so saveth his life. His servant also hee urgeth with many vehement inducements, to submit himselfe to the same remedy; but if a servant obstinately refuse, hee will not alwayes strive with him, nor enforce him to such breaking and renting of his body. But yet, did not his Master seriously desire his healing and life, though hee did not proceed to the cutting asunder of his flesh, which hee saw his servant would not abide to heare of? So in this case, both the elect and men of this world are dangerously sicke of a stony heart; to heale both sorts the Lord useth sundry meanes; promises, judgements, threatnings, and mercies: when all faile, hee perswades them to breake their hearts and the stone thereof, with cutting and wounding of their consciences: when they refuse, hee draweth them both; the one with his almighty power, the other with the cords of man, (viz. such as are resistible) to this cutting and wounding, that their soules might live: and the elect are brought to yeeld; and the men of this world break all cords asunder, and cast away such bonds from them. Shall we now say, God did not seriously desire the healing of such mens hearts, because hee procured not to bind them with strong cords, to breake them with such woundings as they will not abide to heare of? Thus having laid downe the grounds of my judgement touching the first Point, That there is a will and purpose in God for toward the world as well with life, upon condition of obedience; as*

with death, upon condition of disobedience; I come now to the grounds of the second Point.

Examin. You proceed in clearing a difficulty devised and shaped without all ground; as if any sober man would find it strange, that a conditionate will of God should not be accomplished as often as the condition failes. And to this purpose you make use of the nature of a disjunct axiome. All-along I savour others that have grased here, yet have not rested themselves contented with this, but proceeded further to more erroneous opinions.

A second objection you propose, in the second place, the solution whereof you seeme to travell with, much more than of the former: and yet the objection is altogether as causeleſſe, and without all just ground, as the former. I have now been something more than ordinarily conversant in these Controversies, for the space of seventeen yeares; I never yet met with any of our Divines, or any other, that made any question whether Gods will, being granted to passe on any object, were serious yea or no: I should thinke, there is no intelligent man living that makes any doubt of this; but puts it rather out of all question, that whatsoever God wills, hee wills it seriously. I confesse, the *Arminians* doe usually obtrude some such things on our Divines, yet not altogether such; for they doe not obtrude upon us, as if wee said, God doth not will seriously that which hee willeth; but rather, that hee doth not seriously exhort and admonish all those whom hee doth admonish to beleeve and repent: as if hee made shew onely of desiring their obedience and salvation, when indeed hee doth not. Yet, you seeme to sweat not a little in debellating this man of straw. Upon these termes I might easily dispatch my selfe of all further trouble, in examining your elaborate Answer to so causeleſſe an Objection: but I will not; for it may be you insperse something by the way of opposition to that which you doe professe; which is this, That God doth not at all will the obedience and repentance of any but those who are his Elect. And I would not pretermit any evidence you bring to countenance your cause, in opposition to our Tenent, unanswered. That Gods Oath, or Covenant, or the workes of any Person in the Trinity, tends to the end by you mentioned, namely, *to give life to the world*; is utterly untrue. Likewise, it is utterly untrue, that you

have

have hitherunto proved any ſuch thing; For, that which you here deliver as Gods end in giving life, is propoſed ſimply and abſolutely; but that which hitherunto you have endeavoured to prove, is onely this, that *Gods will was to give the world life conditionally*: to wit, upon their obedience and repentance: and that, as, in the laſt place coming to the point, you have expreſſed it in a disjunct axiome, thus, *To give life to the creature, upon his obedience; or to inflict death upon his diſobedience*: Now let any ſober man judge, whether in this caſe the will of God be more to give life, than to inflict death; more paſſing upon the ſalvation of the creature, than upon his eternall condemnation? Could you prove, that God doth will at all the ſalvation of any other ſave his Elect, I would forthwith grant hee wills it ſeriouſly: I ſhould thinke it no leſſe than blaſphemy to thinke, that God doth either will, or ſweare, or covenant, or doe that which hee doth, not ſeriouſly; as blaſphemy conſiſts in attributing that to God which doth not become him. I nothing doubt but that if all and every one ſhould beleeve and repent, all and every one ſhould be ſaved: and none other thing hitherto have you ſo much as adventured to prove, in this particular whereupon now we are. But then, it behoves you to look unto it, on the other ſide, how you cleare your ſelfe from blaſphemy in the ſame kind, while you maintain that God doth will the ſalvation of thoſe which ſhall never be ſaved: which not in my judgement only, but in the judgement of *Auſtin*, of old, doth mainly trench upon Gods omnipotency; for, if hee would ſave them, but doth not, hee is hindered and reſiſted by ſomewhat; and, conſequently, his will is not omnipotent, nor irreſiſtible. And more than this, here-hence it will follow, that either God continues ſtill to will their ſalvation, even after they are damned, or elſe God is changed. And if theſe be not blaſphemies, and foule ones too, I know not what is blaſphemy. I know not what you meane by, ſlighting the ſalvation of mankind; but, ſure I am, it is your own opinion, that in caſe man ſlights the working out of his ſalvation, God is ſo farre from willing his ſalvation, that hee hath unretractably decreed his everlaſting condemnation. As for the ſalvation of mankind, this being an indefinite ſpeech, wee are ready with your ſelfe to maintaine, that God hath peremptorily decreed (to wit) the ſalvation of his Elect; and it is not faire to make uſe of indefinite ſpeeches, the truth whereof

is

is confessed on all hands, by prejudice of an indefinite truth to draw your Readers to the embracing of your definite Tenet, which is void of truth. And can it be denyed by you, that God from everlasting hath decreed the condemnation of them, whose salvation you would not have us thinke he slighteth?

Our Saviours teares not onely argued in him a serious compassion, as man, but a serious desire also of their salvation; and whom hee wept over, out of that love hee owed unto them (being made under the Law) hee was bound to desire their salvation, as wee are bound to desire the salvation of all those to whom we are sent; though this desire on all hands ought to have course (and that by the very Law of God) with submission to his will: But, that it argued in him, as God, a will or desire to save them, your modesty would not permit you to expresse; although the face of your Tenet is as manifestly set towards this marke, as ever our Saviours face was set towards *Jerusalem*. As for the consideration of their peace, which you attribute unto him, were it extant, it were impossible but as God hee should consider it; were it to come to passe, it were no lesse impossible but hee should purpose it and effect it: but seeing it was never to come to passe, hee could no otherwise consider it then as a thing possible, but such as should never come to passe; and it was equally impossible, as the former, that hee should not so consider it. But I doe easily imagine what you meane, though you are very loath to speake it out; (which, to deale plainly with you, is nothing faire) save that I am verily perswaded it proceeds not out of any ill mind in you, but partly out of feare (by speaking plainly) to give offence to good men; and partly out of some conscientiousnesse of your inability to justifie it: namely, that Christ, as God, did consider it as a thing possible, with a tender affection desiring it. And indeed, otherwise the word *tender* added to consideration, attributed to God, comes in very incongruously; for, in proper speech, to consider a thing tenderly, is to consider a thing passionately; which is incident to man, but not to God. As for the other object which you make of Gods consideration, namely, the providing of means for their peace; this is brought in too too unseasonably; for the time thereof was at this time out of season, as our Saviour himselfe signifieth when hee saith, *But now they are hid from thine eyes*: And were it never so seasonable, yet were it little or nothing

thing to the purpoſe; for what outward meanes ſoever he affords them, yet if hee afford them not the efficacious operation of his holy ſpirit, it is a manifeſt document, that his purpoſe is to glorifie himſelfe in their everlaſting condemnation, rather than in their ſalvation. But whereas hitherto you have but prevaricated, pleading for that which no man denyes, namely, that Gods purpoſe towards them is but in a disjunct manner, either for ſalvation if they obey, or for condemnation in caſe they diſobey; or, onely in a conditionate manner willing life unto them, and that, upon ſuch a condition as hee well knowes will never be performed by them; all-along concealing your opinion, and ſparing to deale plainly, in an open profeſſion thereof: Now, at length, you are come to broach it; and that is, not onely that *God wills either their ſalvation or condemnation, according as they ſhall be found to repent or not repent*; or, that *hee wills life unto them, upon condition of their obedience and repentance*; giving hitherto not the leaſt inckling of your meaning to be this, that *hee wills alſo and deſires their obedience and repentance*. Now you take heart to open this myſtery of your meaning alſo, namely, that *there is in God an earneſt and ſerious affection, as concerning the converſion and ſalvation of the world*, which never are, nor ſhall be ſaved: Yet here alſo you give cauſe to complain, that you walk not with a right foot, ſparing to expreſſe your meaning home; for you apply it onely to the people of Iſrael, which is an indefinite terme, and may be applied to the Elect; concerning whom, there is no queſtion *of Gods earneſt and ſerious affection concerning their ſalvation: All are not Iſrael, that are of Iſrael* (ſaith the Apoſtle;) So that Iſrael are Gods choſen, in the Apoſtles phraſe: And there is an *univerſitas electorum*, yea, and *mundus electorum* too; as the Author of the bookes *De vocatione Gentium* obſerveth. Againe, that which, in the places alledged by you, is applied to Iſrael onely, you, by your Tenet, doe, and muſt extend to all that are not elect, to the very Turks and Saracens of theſe dayes, though you have no ſuch exclamations to ſerve your turne withall, to prove Gods earneſt and ſerious affection concerning their ſalvation, though this be the moſt colourable Argument which you have to ſtand you in ſtead, in this particular. But, why ſhould a ſlight and colourable interpretation of holy Scripture caſt you, or any ſober man, upon ſuch an opinion, the abſurdity whereof

is evident by the light of nature? For, doth not God know full well that, notwithstanding all the meanes which hee useth to bring them to obedience, they will still continue in the hardnesse of their heart? Doth hee not also know full well, that hee could give them such a grace as should break the hardnesse of their heart, and make them humble and obedient, with upright hearts? And withall, hath hee not resolved to deny them this grace, which he knew full well would prove effectuall to their conversion, and to grant them only such a grace as hee knew would prove ineffectuall? Now, in this case, let every sober Reader judge, whether God hath any affection to all (much lesse earnest) unto their salvation; and whether hee meaneth not rather to glorifie himselfe in their utter condemnation? To pretermit here my former Arguments, as namely, That this serious and earnest affection, concerning their salvation, must still continue, even after they are damned, or else God is mutable. And, that if God doth earnestly desire their obedience and repentance, that they might be saved; in case they doe nor obey and repent, it followeth, that God is not able to effect it. But nevertheless I am willing to consider the strength of your Argument: it is grounded upon a certaine Scripture phrase, *Oh that there were in this people an heart to fear me! Oh that they were wise! Oh that my people had hearkened unto mee! &c.* Is it not great pity that good men, and good Divines, should be carried away into odde opinions, upon the slight consideration of a phrase? The Hebrew phrase runnes thus, *Quis dabit ut cor eorum sit hujusmodi (i.e. ità dispositum) illis, ut timeant me omnibus diebus vitæ suæ?* This is, *Quis præstabit? Who shall give, or effect, that such an heart were in them, that they might feare mee all their dayes?* Now, I pray, consider; if this were spoken properly, might wee not answer God according to his owne language, and say, O Lord, doest thou aske who shall give or make good unto them such an heart? why who should doe such a worke as this but thy selfe? for thou hast made the heart, and thou alone canst change it; we cannot change an haire of our head, much lesse our heart: and thou in thy Covenant of grace hast undertaken this, even to be our Lord and God, to sanctifie us; and to this purpose thou hast given us thy Sabbath, as a signe that thou the Lord doest sanctifie us: to this end thou hast given us thy word, which is that truth of thine,

according

according unto godlineſſe, which alone can ſanctifie us: and thou haſt promiſed to *circumciſe our hearts, and the hearts of our children, that they ſhall love the Lord our God with all our hearts; and as to love thee, ſo to feare thee alſo; and that, all our dayes:* and to this purpoſe, *to put thy feare in our hearts, that wee ſhall never depart from thee*; yea, and *to put thy ſpirit within us, and to cauſe us to walke in thy ſtatutes, and in thy judgements, and to doe them.* And, ſurely, if God deſires ſuch an heart to be in us, hee will not faile to give us ſuch an heart; ſeeing hee alone is able to worke ſuch an heart in us. Therefore I conclude, this is not to be underſtood properly, but figuratively: And you may as well inferre out of that of the Pſalmiſt, *The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his eares are open unto their prayers*, that God hath eyes and eares, in proper ſpeech; as out of ſuch places as theſe to conclude, that humane ineffectuall deſires and wiſhes and velleities are found in God. If God transferre upon himſelfe the members of our bodies, in a figure of ſpeech called ἀνθρωποπάθεια, why may hee not as well transferre upon himſelfe, by the ſame figure of ſpeech, the deſires and affections of our minds? eſpecially, conſidering that God hath made us apt to be moved and wrought upon by ſuch paſſionate expreſſions; and it is Gods uſuall courſe to worke in all things agreeably to their natures. And I make no queſtion but ſuch expreſſions are uſually prevalent with true Iſraelites, with Gods owne people; not ſo much by the force of a paſſionate expreſſion, which is accommodated to the condition of mans nature, as chiefly by the operation of Gods Spirit, whoſe *ſword the Word of God is.*

I doubt not but Gods will is *ſerious*, what way or courſe ſoever it takes; but you are very adventurous upon your Readers credulity, in endeavouring to perſwade him, that God willeth ſuch a gracious heart in them, in whom hee means not to worke; conſidering, as I preſume your ſelfe beleeve (although this diſcourſe of yours makes mee not a little to ſtagger in this mine apprehenſion) that God alone is able to worke ſuch an heart in any: yet you labour to expedite a facile way unto our faith, or credulity rather, to take hold of your Propoſition by a familiar compariſon; *A father* (you ſay) *perſwades both his ſonne and his ſervant to be cut, both being dangerouſly ſicke of the ſtone; but when perſwaſions will not ſerve with his ſonne, hee taketh him and bindeth him*

hand and foot, and cauſeth him to endure it: The ſervant hee continueth to perſwade to endure the like courſe of cure, but proceedeth no further. In this caſe, you ſay, *the Maſter doth ſeriouſly deſire the healing and life of his ſervant, though he did not proceed to the cutting aſunder of his fleſh:* I grant all this; but I wonder not a little that your ſelfe doe not obſerve the incongruity in this compariſon, which on no ſide is ſutable; for the ſonne, in this caſe, is made to be cut againſt his will, that hee may be healed; but God forceth no man to converſion and repentance againſt his will, that hee may be healed; for, indeed, *voluntas non poteſt cogi*, at leaſt in reſpect of *actus eliciti*, wherein conſiſts repentance and converſion. On the other ſide, the ſervant is no more willing to be cut than the ſon, for it is not in the power of man to change the will either of ſervant or of ſonne; but this is in Gods power, and with an omnipotent facility, as *Auſtin* ſpeakes, *Omnipotenti facilitate convertit, & ex nolentibus volentes facit:* Now, put the caſe that the Maſter ſhould know, that of all the meanes hee could uſe to make his ſervant willing to endure the cutting, none but one would prevaile with him, and that one would prevaile with him to make him willing; ſhould the Maſter uſe all other meanes, which hee well knew would prove ineffectuall, and purpoſely forbeare the other, which hee well knew would prove prevalent? In this caſe, ſpeake freely, I pray, whether this man did ſeriouſly and earneſtly deſire the cutting and healing of his ſervant, and not rather the contrary? To put the caſe home unto you; you know what admonition *David* upon his death-bed gave to *Solomon* concerning *Shimei, Thou ſhalt not count him innocent, for thou art a wiſe man, and knoweſt what thou oughteſt to doe unto him; and thou ſhalt cauſe his hoare head to goe downe to the grave with blood:* yet withall, *Solomon* muſt have a care of *David* his fathers oath; for when *Shimei* came to meet *David* at *Jordan*, *David* ſware unto him by the Lord, ſaying, *I will not ſlay thee with the ſword:* Now while *Solomon* meditated on ſome courſe to take with *Shimei*, ſuppoſe God ſhould reveale unto him, ſaying, *If thou propoſeſt ſuch a condition unto him, to wit, of building him an houſe in* Jeruſalem, *and to ſtay there, and not paſſe over the brook* Kidron, hee will tranſgreſſe; but if thou propoſeſt any other like condition, hee will obſerve it: and hereupon *Solomon* ſhould be moved to propoſe this condition, which hee knew

knew *Shimei* would tranſgreſſe; judge, I pray, whether this courſe propoſed to *Shimei* were an evidence of *Solomons* earneſt and ſerious affection, concerning the ſaving of *Shimei*'s life; and not rather concerning his deſtruction? In like ſort, when God perſwades many by his Miniſters to make them new hearts and new ſpirits, and himſelfe alone, by the power of his Spirit, is able to take the ſtony heart out of their bowels, and give them an heart of fleſh; when he reſolves to afford this grace unto ſome, but not unto others; let every one judge hereby, whether God can be ſaid earneſtly to deſire the changing of their hearts, when hee reſolves to forbeare that courſe which alone can change them? No, no, this diſcourſe ſavoureth ſtrongly of a conceit, that it is in the power of an unregenerate man to change his owne heart, and of an heart of ſtone to change it into an heart of fleſh: And in this caſe, I confeſſe, it were very probable that God ſhould earneſtly deſire it; provided that any ineffectuall and changeable deſires were incident unto God.

Anſw. *That when God putteth forth the ſecond act of poſitive retribution,* viz. *the rejection of the world, or decree of their condemnation, God doth behold and conſider the world, eſpecially men of riper yeares, not* in maſſa primitus corrupta, *nor as newly fallen in* Adam; *but as voluntarily falling off, by ſome act of careleſſe and wilfull diſobedience. To prove this, I need not produce other reaſons then what I have formerly alledged in the fore-going Point; for when God did expreſſe, by his oath, his will and good pleaſure to be, not for the death, but life and converſion of ſinners, was it not after the fall of* Adam, *and all his poſterity in him? then, notwithſtanding the preſuppoſall of the fall, God had not yet rejected the creature; but, as hee there declareth himſelfe, ſtill retaineth and reſerveth thoughts of peace towards them, even a deſire of their converſion unto life.*

Againe, with whom did the Lord enter into a Covenant of life and death, upon condition of obedience and diſobedience? was it not with Adam *onely, and his poſterity in his loynes, in the ſtate of innocency, by the law written in their heart? Was it not alſo after* Adams *fall renewed to all his poſterity, both Jewes and Gentiles? Then, yet God had not caſt them away in the fall, though the fall had juſtly deſerved it; but expecteth yet further to ſee how they will yet keep this renewed Covenant with him, before hee*

cast them off as Reprobates: Even Cain *himselfe, the eldest sonne of Reprobation, is after the fall offered acceptance of Gods hand if hee doe well. Moreover, is it not after the fall that the Father, by his workes of creation and providence, judgements and mercies, &c. the Sonne by his enlightening the world, by his death and ministery of his servants; and the Holy Ghost by his calling and knocking at the hearts of the wicked, doe all strive with men, even to this very end, to turne them to the Lord, that iniquity may not be their destruction? If therefore all the Persons in the Trinity doe provide severall helpfull meanes for the conversion and salvation of the world; of the world, I say, now after the fall lying in wickednesse, surely God did not then upon the fall reprobate the world unto eternall condemnation and perdition. If you say, God might well reprobate the world unto condemnation upon the fall, and yet still after the fall use meanes for their conversion and salvation; because those meanes doe but further aggravate their condemnation: I answer, these doe indeed further aggravate their condemnation, but it is but by accident onely, by their neglect and abuse of them; but the proper end which God himselfe, of himselfe, aimes at in the use of these meanes, himselfe plainly expresseth it to be, not the aggravation or procurement of their condemnation, but the restoring of them to salvation and life; as hath been before declared. So then, to draw all to an head, the summe of this first reason is, If God after the fall doe retaine a will and purpose to restore life to the world upon an equall condition, then hee did not upon the fall, or upon the onely consideration of the fall, reject the world of the ungodly unto their utter perdition. But, you see, God retaineth after the fall an holy will and purpose of restoring life unto the world upon an equall condition, as appeareth by his Oath, by his Covenant, and by his Workes; therefore the conclusion, which is the point in hand, is evident.*

Examin. I marvell what you meane to call Gods decree of condemnation his act of retribution; retribution being an act temporall and transient, the decree of God is an act immanent and eternall: And therefore it is not so handsomely said to be the putting forth of an act, for so much as it is immanent and not transient. 'Tis manifest, I confesse, that sin is alwayes precedent to the retribution of punishment; as it is without controversie, that sinne neither is nor can be antecedent to Gods decree, sinne being temporall,

but

but all Gods decrees eternall. And I have found it by experience to be an uſuall courſe with our Adverſaries, to confound condemnation with the decree of condemnation. And *Junius* himſelfe, very incongruouſly, in my judgement, calls this decree, *Praedamnatio*; to make the fairer place, as I gueſſe, for *ſins praecedencie* thereunto, at leaſt in conſideration: But no neceſſity urgeth us to any ſuch courſe; and wee may well maintaine, that God in this decree of condemnation hath alwayes the conſideration of that ſinne for which hee purpoſeth to damne them; for, undoubtedly, hee decrees to condemne no man but for ſinne. It is impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe; condemnation, in the notion thereof, formally including ſinne. But I like not your expreſſions in the diſtinction you make, ſaying, *God conſiders men in this ſinne, not as newly fallen in* Adam, *but as voluntarily falling off* (you mean long after) *by ſome act of careleſſe and wilfull diſobedience*, When God made this decree, they were not newly (that is, a little before) fallen in *Adam*; for that fall in *Adam* was temporall, but the decrees of God are eternall: And to conſider as newly fallen, when as yet they were not, much leſſe were they fallen, is not ſo much to conſider, as to erre or feigne. But like as God decreed to ſuffer all to fall in *Adam*, and many alſo to continue both therein, and in bringing forth the bitter fruits thereof even untill death; ſo he purpoſed to condemne them for thoſe ſinnes: but take heed you doe not make an order of *prius* and *poſterius* between theſe decrees; leſt either you make the decree of condemnation precedent to the decree of permiſſion of thoſe ſinnes for which they ſhall be condemned, which will be directly contradictory to your Tenet here; or, making Gods decree of permitting ſuch ſinnes for which they ſhall be condemned precedent to his decree of condemnation, (whereunto you doe encline unawares) which will caſt you upon miſerable inconveniences, and that by your owne rule already delivered; for if the decree of permitting ſinne be firſt in intention, then, by the rules received by you, it ſhould be laſt in execution; that is, men ſhould be condemned for ſinne, before they be permitted to ſinne: But the conjunction of theſe decrees into one, as in the ſame moment of nature and reaſon, will both prevent this inconvenience, and alſo juſtifie Gods decree of condemnation, to proceed upon the conſideration of thoſe ſinnes for which hee purpoſeth to condemne them. But then there is another

another point of great moment, which in like manner must be accorded unto, though you seeme to be little aware of it, (though, I willingly confesse, this over-sight is very generall) namely, that God decreeth the salvation of none of ripe yeares, but upon, or with a joynt consideration of their faith, repentance, and good workes. For, let us first make the decrees of salvation and condemnation matches: As for example, Reprobation, as it is accounted the decree of condemnation, is a decree of punishing with everlasting death. Now, if you will match Election unto this, as it is the decree of salvation, it must be conceived as a decree of rewarding with everlasting life. Now let any man judge, whether this decree must not as necessarily be conjoyned with the consideration of faith, repentance, and good works, in men of ripe years; as the decree of condemnation, or of punishing with everlasting death, must be conjoyned with the consideration of those sinnes for which God purposeth to punish them. And I will further demonstrate it thus: Like as the decree of permitting some men to sinne, and to continue therein to the end, and Gods decree of condemning for sinne, are joynt decrees, neither afore nor after other; and consequently, the decree of condemning for sinne must necessarily be conjoyned with the consideration of sinne: In like sort, Gods decree of giving some faith, repentance, and good workes, and his decree of rewarding them with everlasting life, are joynt decrees, neither of them afore or after other; and consequently, Gods decree of saving them, and rewarding them with everlasting life, is joyned with the consideration of their faith, repentance, and good workes. Now that these are joynt decrees I prove thus: First, the decree of salvation cannot precede the decree of giving faith and repentance; for if it should, then salvation were the end of faith and repentance; but salvation is not the end, as I prove thus: The end is such as doth necessarily bespeake the meanes tending thereunto; but salvation doth not necessarily bespeake faith and repentance tending thereunto: for, God intending the salvation of Angels, brought it to passe without faith and repentance; as likewise, the salvation of many an infant hee brings to passe without faith and repentance. Secondly, the end of Gods actions can be nothing but himselfe, and his owne glory; and therefore salvation it selfe must have for end the glory of God. Now, examine what glory of God is manifested in mans salvation,

ſalvation, and it will forthwith appeare upon due examination, that the glory of God manifeſted in mans ſalvation, is ſuch as whereunto not ſalvation only doth tend, but diverſe other things joyntly concurring with ſalvation thereunto. As for example, Gods glory manifeſted on the elect, is in the higheſt degree of grace, but in the way of mercie mixt with juſtice: This requires permiſſion of ſin, the ſending of Chriſt to make ſatisfaction for ſinne, faith and repentance, (for Gods juſtice is ſeen partly in conferring ſalvation by way of reward) and laſt of all ſalvation. Out of all theſe reſults the glory of God in doing good to his creature in the higheſt degree of grace, proceeding in the way of mercie mixt with 3 juſtice. Thirdly, if God gave faith and repentance to this end, to bring his elect unto ſalvation, as to the end thereof, then, by juſt proportion of reaſon, God ſhould deny the gift of faith and repentance unto others; that is, to permit them finally to perſevere in their ſinnes, thereby to procure their condemnation as the end thereof: which you will not affirme, neither can it with any ſobrietie be affirmed. In the next place I will ſhew, that neither can the decree of giving faith and repentance, precede the decree of ſalvation; for if it ſhould, then ſhould faith & repentance be the laſt in execution; to wit, if it were firſt in intention, and conſequently men ſhould firſt be ſaved, and afterwards have faith and repentance granted unto them. Thus I have ſhewed my readineſſe to concurre with you in opinion in this particular; and that upon other grounds than yours: and whoſe grounds are more ſound, yours or mine, I am content to remit it to the judgement of any indifferent Reader. As for your reaſon here mentioned, repeating onely what you have formerly delivered, as touching *the will and good pleaſure of God*, not for *the death*, but for *the life*, not onely of the elect, but of all others alſo; the vanitie of this aſſertion of yours, I thinke I have ſufficiently diſcovered. And I wonder you ſhould carry it thus, *not of the death, but of the life*; when muſt an end you have carried it onely thus hitherunto; that Gods willing their life, is onely upon condition of their obedience and repentance, not otherwiſe: Or, in a disjunct axiome, thus, Either of life in caſe they repent, or of death in caſe they did not repent; and what ſhould move you to call this a willing to give them life, and not to inflict death? Why ſhould you not rather call it a will to inflict death, and not to give life; conſidering that God was

resolved to deny them such grace, as would effectually bring them to obedience and repentance; and to grant them only such a grace, as he fore-knew full well, would never bring them to obedience and repentance? 1. *Cain* was of the familie of *Adam*, to whom the promise was made concerning the seed of the woman, that he should break the serpents head; and although *Cain* was offered acceptance upon his repentance, yet it followeth not that all were offered the same acceptance, even those that never received any tidings or promise concerning the *Messiah*. And the Apostle plainly signifies, that the *Gentiles* were not admonished to repent untill Christ was preached unto them, *Act.* 17. 30. But suppose it were so, yet this hinders nothing at all the precedencie of the decree of condemnation, unto the decree of giving such a Covenant and permitting them to dispise it. For, because God purposed to damne them for such a sinne, therefore hee might decree to give them such a Covenant, and permit them, or expose them, (by leaving them destitute of his grace) to the despising of it: Not that I doe approve of any such conceit, as before I have manifested; but to shew how short your discourse falls of making good that which you undertake to prove. And I am much deceived, if you mistake not their tenet, who make reprobation to proceed upon the consideration of the corrupt masse in *Adam*: For, undoubtedly, their meaning hereupon is not to maintaine that God did purpose to condemne all reprobates only for the sin of *Adam*, or for originall sinne drawne from him: this were a very mad conceit. But supposing that by *Adams* fall an impotency of doing that which is good is come upon all; as it is free for God to give grace to whom he will, and so to bring them to salvation, the purpose whereof is called Gods election; so is it enough for God to deny grace to whom he will, and thereby to expose them to condemnation: the purpose whereof in God, is that which wee call Reprobation; which, as *Aquinas* saith, *Includit voluntatem permittendi peccatum, & damnationem inferendi pro peccato.* Now of this generall impotency of doing good, which cleaves unto all since the fall of *Adam*, you take no notice at all, though herein consists the very ἀκμὴ of these controversies but; carry your selfe throughout in such manner, as if, notwithstanding that shipwracke of grace, which all humane soules made in *Adam*, it were still as much in guns power to obey God, as it was before; or as

mans power to rise by repentance now after he is fallen, as it was in his power to stand in his integrity, and in obedience unto God before he was fallen. Put the case all were true that you deliver in the next place, namely, that God the Father, Sonne and Holy Ghost proceed in the way of admonition and exhortation to turne themselves to the Lord, that iniquitie might not be their ruine; yet this hinders not but that the decree of condemnation might be precedent to Gods decree of taking such a course, and permitting them to resist it. For, upon a purpose to condemne them for such a sinne, he might thereupon resolve to expose them to such a sinne: And if God should first decree to permit such a sinne, and then decree to condemne them for it, the permission of this sinne being first in intention, should by your owne rule be last in execution; that is, first men should be condemned for such a sin, and afterwards they should be suffered to commit it: Not that I maintaine any such order, but onely to represent the weakenesse of your discourse, approaching shrewdly to such a disorderly constitution of Gods decrees, and nothing at all preventing the most harsh tenet that can be devised. Againe, this that here you deliver, were it granted you, yet doth it nothing hinder the corrupt masse in *Adam*, to be the object of Gods decree of condemnation. For, albeit God the Father, and God the Sonne faile not of performing all this you speak of, yet if by reason of the generall impotency which is come on all, they are nothing able to obey these motions of Gods spirit, and withall God purposeth to deny them a further grace to make them to obey; shall not this be sufficient to expose them to condemnation, even for this sinne of resisting the motions of Gods spirit? But now let us consider your discourse it selfe, and what weight it carrieth, which onely makes a shew of much, but comes to nothing in the end. First you please your selfe in devising distinct workes, applyed to the distinct persons in the Trinitie, without all ground in my judgement. We commonly say, *Opera Trinitatis ad extra sunt indivisibilia.* Were not the Sonne and the Holy Ghost as active in the creation, and are still in the workes of providence, as the Father? How Christ enlightned the world by his death is a mystery to me; his doctrine I confesse did, and much more the doctrine of his Apostles: But in this ministerie of Christs servants, were not the Father and the Holy Ghost as operative as the Sonne? As for the

knocking of the ſpirit at mens hearts, you nothing diſtinguiſh it; for ought I found hitherto, from the miniſterie of Chriſts ſervants in admoniſhing and exhorting; which worke is yet the Fathers and the Sonnes aſwell as the Spirits. But whereas you ſay, all this is done for this very end, *To turne them to the Lord, that iniquitie might not be their deſtruction*; I pray you obſerve your owne words well: all the operations you ſpecifie are drawn from theſe two heads, Inſtruction and Admonition to turn to the Lord; and the end of all this, you ſay, is to turne to the Lord. Put theſe together, that you may behold the ſobrietie of this diſcourſe. God exhorts them to turne to the Lord, to this end, to turne them to the Lord: As much as to ſay, God exhorts them to turne to the Lord, to this end, that in caſe they obey his voice, and turne to the Lord which is their part, then God will performe his part alſo, and turne them to the Lord. But what need, I pray, of Gods worke in turning them to the Lord, after they have performed their part ſo well as to turne themſelves to the Lord? Againe, if God hath a purpoſe to turne them to the Lord, why doth he not? Is it becauſe they refuſe to performe ſome act, upon the performance whereof God would turne them to himſelf? Now I would gladly know what act that is, which God expects to be performed, that ſo he might turne them to the Lord. I am verily perſwaded your ſelfe are not willing to be put to deſigne this: Is it the very act of turning to the Lord, or leſſe, or more? If the very act of turning to the Lord, you fall upon a manifeſt abſurditie before ſpecified: if leſſe then turning to the Lord, then 'tis leſſe than a good act; and ſhall God reward that which is leſſe then a good act with converſion unto him? What is it to conferre grace according to the workes of nature, if this be not? Yet I would faine know what this act is? Leaſt of all will you ſay, 'tis more than turning to the Lord, for that ſhould ſuppoſe converſion unto the Lord already wrought; and conſequently, no need that God ſhould turne them to the Lord, which ſuppoſeth that they were not before turned to the Lord at all. The providing of ſeverall helpfull meanes for the ſalvation of the world after the fall, doth nothing hinder Gods reprobating of the world upon the fall unto eternall condemnation and perdition. For if hee purpoſe to deny them grace to obey theſe meanes, this ſhall bee ſufficient to expoſe them to condemnation, even for the deſpiſing

of those meanes of grace which God purposeth to provide for them; and accordingly the objection here proposed is found. And whereas you answere, that these meanes doe aggravate their condemnation by accident onely; to wit, through their neglect and abuse of them: I answere, that this their neglect and abuse doth by necessiry consequence follow upon Gods purpose to deny them effectuall grace for the using of those meanes aright; like as upon Gods purpose to harden *Pharaohs* heart, that hee should not let *Israel* goe, it followed by necessiry consequence, that *Pharaoh*, through the hardnesse of his heart, would not let *Israel* goe. But that Gods end is (as you say) the *restoring of men to salvation and life*; as if God did will and purpose any such thing, is utterly untrue, and nothing proved by you hitherto, but rather flatly contradictorie to that you have most an end delivered; partly in making Gods will of their salvation to be onely in a disjunct manner, and partly of a conditionate manner, which is no more to will their salvation, than their damnation, in case they were indifferent to performe either condition. But in case they be found unable to performe the condition of life, and most prone to performe the condition of death, God meaning not to give them such a grace as alone can relieve them, it is (manifestly) an evidence, that God wills their condemnation, and nothing at all their salvation. Not to mention any other arguments against this conceit; the one drawn from Gods omnipotency, the other from his immutabilitie.

In the recapitulation of this reason, you help your selfe with a phrase, and onely with a phrase: *God retaines a will and purpose to restore life to the world upon an equall condition.* Obedience is due to God, though man be not able to performe it. And therefore God, in requiring that which is due unto him, carrieth himselfe in an equall (I had rather say, in a just) course, though man becoming banckrupt, be not able to performe it. But in this case, namely, if God will not restore life, but upon performance of such a condition which he is utterly unable to performe, and withall purposeth to deny him that grace, which should inable him to performe it; is not this a manifest document, that God hath no purpose to restore life unto him? Yet I confesse, the phrase used is advantageous unto you; for, at the hearing of an equall condition, most are apt to conceive the condition to be such as lyeth

to a mans power to performe. But you have not hitherunto manifested any such opinion of mans abilitie: If you have entertained any such (as whereunto pastorall Divines, dealing much upon exhortation, are sometimes over-prone, though I see small cause why the opinion of mans impotency unto good should any whit rebate the edge of their exhortation) you should doe well to convince your adversaries by argument, and not circumvent them.

Answ. 2. *From the condition of those men, upon whom the scriptures pronounce reprobation, or rejection; I no where read of reprobation, but of such men to whom the meanes of grace, or at least, of the knowledge of God in some measure or other have been offered in vaine. In the Old Testament God pronounceth the house of* Judah *reprobate silver, rejected by him: But when? Not till they were all become revolters, and corrupters, and till the meanes hee had used to purge and cleanse them had been attempted in vaine.* The bellows (*saith hee*) are burnt, the lead is consumed in the fire, the founder melteth in vaine, and reprobate silver shall men call them, because the Lord hath rejected them. *When did God reject all further care of purging the people from their filthinesse any more? Not till after hee had used meanes to purge them, and they were not purged. When doth the Sonne of God, under the name of wisdome, reject the wicked? Not till after he had called upon them earnestly to return, & stretched out his hands unto them, & offered to poure out his spirit upon them; and they after all this, had set at nought his counsell, and despised the meanes of their owne reformation. Prov. 1.*

In the New Testament, the Apostle speaks of reprobates, in case so powerfull a ministery as his was, so long a time dispensed unto them, and had notwithstanding been vainly received by them, and that as yet they knew not themselves to be in Christ. Yea, the Gentiles *themselves, when did God give them up to a reprobate minde? Was it not after they had disregarded the acknowledging and glorifying of God, according to the meanes they had received? In a word, when doth God shut up the Sonnes of* Adam, *either* Jewes *or* Gentiles, *under enmitie against Christ, and set forth Christ in enmitie against them, thereby excluding them from atonement with him, or by him with God? Is it not after they are become the seed of the Serpent? Now, by the seed of the Serpent cannot be meant, all men fallen and corrupted in* Adam *by originall*

sin (though that fall was wrought by the suggestion and practice of the Serpent) for then all the seed of Adam *had been shut up in enmitie against Christ, and cut off from all fellowship with him their head. But by the seed of the Serpent I understand, all such men of the world, as have the image of the old Serpent stamped upon them, which is a will set to doe the lusts of the devill.* Saith our Saviour to the *Jewes*, Yee are of your father the devill, and the lusts of your father ye will doe: *or, which is all one, an hatred of the light when it cometh amongst them; and which is a character of the devill, a lover of darknesse rather then light. Upon which point it is our Saviour shutteth up the men of this world under condemnation. viz. When by the hatred of the light they have drunke in the venome, and received the image of the old Serpent; till which time, men are counted the seed of* Adam: *Or, if they be borne in the Church the seed of* Abraham, *rather then the seed of the Serpent. For our Divines doe wisely and justly maintaine against the Anabaptists, that the seed of* Abraham, *as pertaining to the Covenant, are not only his spirituall seed, partakers of his faith; but also his children after the flesh, till by their careless and willfull disobedience they have excluded themselves from the Covenant of* Abraham; *From whence it is, that all the seed of* Abraham, *even the carnall seed, are sealed up by Circumcision or Baptisme under the Covenant of* Abraham. *Neither are they excluded from hope of benefit by the Covenant and the seales and ordinances of it, till that, with prophane* Esau, *they dispise this their birth-right, and sell the pledges of their inheritance for some base and sensuall lust. Now, if all such are to be accounted the seed of* Abraham, *till, by despising the Covenant, they have broken off themselves from partaking with him in the fatnesse of the olive; then surely, even the carnall seed of* Abraham *are not the seed of the Serpent from their originall pollution, but doe become afterwards, by their actuall voluntary rebellion.*

Iohn. 8. Iohn. 3.

As there is an election eternall, and election temporall, so in both senses the word is taken in holy scripture. Of election eternall we read, *Ephes.* 1. 4. where God is said to have *chosen us in Christ, that wee should be holy, before the foundation of the world.* Of election temporall wee read, 1 *Cor.* 1. 26. *Brethren, you see your calling, how that not many wisemen after the flesh, &c. But God hath chosen the foolish things, &c.* Where Election

Examin.

is

is taken as all one with vocation, in proportion whereunto wee muſt diſtinguiſh of reprobation. And like as Election temporall is all one with effectuall vocation, as when men find mercy at the hands of God to obey their callings: So reprobation temporall is all one with obduration, as when men are not, through the mercy of God and power of his grace, brought about to obey their calling, but through the hardneſſe of their hearts, uncorrected by the Iohn. 8. Iohn. 3. ſpirit of God, they ſtand out, and refuſe to obey when they are called. Now like as it followeth not, that becauſe men are not elect, in reſpect of Election temporall, untill they obey their calling, therefore God did conſider them as obedient to their calling before hee elected them unto life: In like ſort it followeth not, that becauſe men are not reprobate in reſpect of reprobation temporall, untill they are found to diſobey their calling; *Ergo*, God did conſider them as diſobedient to their calling before he reprobated them unto death: albeit there is a vaſt difference between Election and Reprobation. For if once men be found truly to obey their calling, hereby as they are effectually called, ſo they may be aſſured of their eternall Election unto grace, and conſequently unto glory alſo. But although men for a while are found to diſobey their calling, though hereby they are obdurated, yet no evidence ariſeth here-hence of their non-election unto grace, and conſequently of their reprobation from grace, and as from grace ſo from glory alſo. The reaſon is, becauſe nothing but finall obduration and continuance in ſinne is an evidence of Reprobation eternall: though in this caſe they may be accounted reprobate two wayes: Firſt in a negative oppoſition to Election temporall; for certainly in this caſe they are not as yet effectually called, that is, converted unto God. Secondly, they may be called reprobate as it hath the ſignification of an adjective, and not of a participle; like as ἐκλεκτὸς is ſometimes uſed in holy ſcripture, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *Revel.* 17. 14. 2 *Joh.* 1. 14. And the word Reprobate in thoſe places you take advantage of, is rather an adjective then a participle. As for Reprobation in oppoſition to Election eternall, that is expreſſed in holy Scripture by the not writing mens names in the book of life: which ſignifies Gods purpoſe to deny them both grace and glory; and they are commonly ſtiled ἀπολλύμενοι rendred, ſuch as periſh; 1 *Cor.* 1. 18. and 2 *Cor.* 4. 3. And on the contrary, the Elect are called σωζόμενοι, 1 *Cor.* 1. 18. *But unto*

us which are saved, it is the power of God. And *Act. 2. last v. God added daily to the Church,* τοὺς σωζομένους. But then, whereas by consequent followeth their continuance in sinne and condemnation, there is also in scripture a decree of God called Ordination unto wrath, 1 *Thes.* 5. 9. And as there is a preparing [κατηρτισμένα] unto destruction, and a creating unto an evill day; so there must consequently be acknowledged in God a purpose to prepare to destruction, and to create against the day of evill. But let us come to the particular scanning of your discourse.

I willingly acknowledge that (as you say) wee no where read in scripture of Reprobation, but of such men to whom the meanes of grace, or at least of the knowledge of God in some measure or other hath been offered in vaine. This qualification is brought in to prevent an exception out of *Rom.* 1. Where the *Gentiles* are said to be given over into a reprobate minde; who yet had not the meanes of grace: But they had (you will say) the knowledge of God in some measure; you meane, the meanes of the knowledge of God, and these meanes are the world, wherein they are brought forth; for the world containes the workes of God, and by them are manifested the invisible things of God, even his eternall power and Godhead. And indeed these meanes of the knowledge of God, all enjoy in equall measure, according to the proportion of the time of their lives. But, to discover unto you the loosnesse of this your discourse, I pray you consider, the sinne of the *Gentiles* here taxed, *is the transforming of the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things*; contrary unto that knowledge which they did or might attaine unto by Gods workes. Their judgement was their giving over into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient, as there it followeth. And doe you thinke indeed, that all such Idolaters were given over into a reprobate minde to doe such abominable things, as after are mentioned? Were there not found many morall men among the Heathens, which yet were reprobates as well as the most prophane amongst them? Nay, what thinke you of them, amongst whom this sinne of transforming the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things, was not found; as *Varro* writes of the Romans, that for above an hundred yeares they had no Images, and that in those dayes the Gods were worshipped more chastely; and that they who brought in

Images were to blame in two respects: First, because *errorem induxerunt*. The Second, because *timorem ademerunt*: and were not they, thinke you, given over into a reprobate minde? Lastly, but if so they were given over, are you indeed perswaded that none of these were the elect of God? Doth not the contrary appeare manifestly in the Corinthians? For, were not they, as well as others, in former time *carried away after dumbe Idols, as they were led?* 1 Cor. 12. 2. Were not they also given over into a reprobate minde? Were not they fornicatours, idolaters, adulterers, wantons, buggerers, &c? 1 Cor. 6. 9, 11. Yet they *were sanctified* in due time; notwithstanding all this, they *were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God.* Therefore I conclude, it is one thing to be a reprobate in that sense wee here speak of reprobates; for wee speak of reprobates in opposition to Gods elect. But undoubtedly the very elect of God may be for a time, and that for a long time, given over into a reprobate minde. Againe, is Reprobation onely of those to whom the meanes of grace have been offered in vaine? and is Reprobation pronounced on none but such? Then, belike, Reprobation is not eternall, but temporall; and consequently, nothing pertinent to our present purpose: And I could wish you had expressed wherein this Reprobation temporall, which is pronounc't upon men after the meanes of grace have been offered unto them in vaine, doth consist. For, to use words signifying wee know not what, maketh all our disputation as much in vaine, as to draw water with a bucket that hath no bottome. Sure I am, noe receiving of the meanes of grace in vaine is an evidence of that Reprobation wee speak of, unlesse it be finall, though well it may be of giving over into a reprobate minde for the present. But devise what you will to be the act of Reprobation temporall you speak of, will it therefore follow that the consideration of this contumacie in standing our against the meanes of grace, was with God before his purpose thus to reprobate? As for example, because finall impenitency and infidelity go before condemnation, will you therefore infer, that the consideration of finall impenitencie and infidelitie did precede Gods purpose of condemnation? By the same course you may conclude, that because faith, and repentance, and good works, and perseverance in all this, goes before a mans salvation, therefore the consideration of all these was precedent to Gods purpose of

salvation. And indeed it cannot be avoided, but that this doctrine of yours in the point of Reprobation, must necessarily overthrow your owne doctrine concerning Gods election; though this is little considered usually. And how can God know mans finall impenitency, unlesse he purpose to permit it? And if the permission of finall impenitency be in Gods intention before condemnation, then, by your owne rules, it must be after it in execution; and so men shall be condemned for their impenitency before they have committed it. It is true, the *Jewes* are pronounced reprobate silver, *Jerem.* 6. 30. after the Prophets labour was found in vaine; but you do not well to extend this unto Reprobation in that sense wee speake of it: For, in your owne opinion, nothing but finall obstinacie doth make men reprobate; but such was not as yet the obstinacie of those *Jewes*, who are there called reprobate silver. And how uncharitable a thing were it for you, or any man, to thinke that none of those obstinate *Jewes* were afterwards converted unto God by the ministerie of the Prophet *Jeremiah*. Yet, admit it were finall, such I confesse precedes condemnation which is temporall; But will you herence inferre it precedes also Reprobation, or the decree of condemnation, which is eternall? But there is no tolerable good consequence in this; and you might as well inferre, that good workes are precedent to election, as I have already shewed. And withall, hereby you should constitute a very wild order of things in execution: Yet, I grant, every obstinacie, so long as men continue in it, making a show of godlinesse, is sufficient to constitute them reprobate silver, and such as are given over into a reprobate minde. Were it so, that after God hath used meanes to purge the people, and they would not be purged, then hee rejects all further care of purging them from their filthinesse any more; will you inferre therence, that the consideration of this contempt of the meanes of grace goes before Reprobation, as it signifies the decree of condemnation? And consider you not, that thus the permission of this obstinacie in Gods intention, must goe before condemnation, and consequently must follow after it in execution? That is, men shall first be condemned, and afterwards suffered to despise the meanes of grace. Againe, doth not faith, and repentance, and good workes, in like manner precede salvation? And must not the consideration of all these by like reason goe before Election? Besides all this, it is an untruth which you

delivers, that after men have refused to be purged when God would have purged them, forthwith hee gives off all further care of purging them from their filthinesse. How many thousands are there in this Kingdome, who are guiltie, and for many yeares have been guiltie, of refusing to be purged when God would have purged them: yet doth not God give over all further care of purging them from their filthinesse? and who dares say, that none of them shall be converted unto God ere they die? Doth not *Paul* warne *Timothie* to carry himselfe gently towards them that are without, waiting *εἰ πώς*, if at length God will give them repentance, &c.? And why should wee despaire of any, so long as God suffers them to live, and injoy the meanes of grace? Neither doth the Prophet *Ezech.* 24. 13. expresse or signifie, that God in this case gives over all further care of purging their filthinesse, onely professeth that hee will not spare them any longer: *They should not be purged, till he had caused his wrath to light upon them.* But might not some of them be purged from their filthines after this? And might not the lighting of Gods wrath upon them be a meanes of this? Nay, is not this Gods ordinarie course, when his word is received in vaine, to exercise his people with affliction, and that to this end, even to purge away their drosse till it be pure, and take away all their tinne? *Isai.* 1. And did not the Lord promise as much by the mouth of *Ezechiel* also, and that in reference to the very same wrath of God, as a meanes of their reformation? What else meaneth that, *I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the Countries, and will consume thy filthinesse out of thee?* Ezek. 22. 15. Your second question is of the very same nature, and admits in every particular the very same answer.

From the old Testament you come unto the new: That of the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. you straine miserablie to make it serve your turne. For till you salve your turne at pleasure in the word *ἀδόκιμος*, which is meerly the privation of *δόκιμος*, yet you inforce it to signifie a desperate condition, which is utterly repugnant to the genius of the Apostles text: who admonisheth them to prove themselves, whether they were in the faith, to humble them if they found themselves otherwise; not to preach desperation unto them. Neither doth the Apostle inferr the condition of reprobates (such as these I speake of) from the receiving of the grace of God by a powerfull ministerie (such as *Pauls* was) offered unto them:

them in vaine; but from the not having Christ in them. In this case, whatsoever their minister was, and how little time soever, as well as how long they had injoyed the Gospel, hee pronounced them reprobates: As, indeed, till men are effectually called, there is noe necessitie that there should be any difference between the Elect and Reprobates considered in themselves: Albeit in respect of the different purposes of God towards them, there is a very great difference. That out of the 1. to the *Rom.* as concerning the *Gentiles* given up to a reprobate minde, I have already spoken sufficient. I like *Piscators* interpretation of εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν better then yours: Hee renders it thus, *in mentem omnis judicii expertem.* And I pray tell me, doe you not thinke they were given over εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, before their transforming of the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things? Were it not so, how could they have been guiltie of so foule a transformation? It is true, hee gave them up also to a reprobate minde, to doe things uncomely, and to corrupt their lives also, with horrible uncleanesse. Yet, I have shewed out of 1 *Cor.* 6. that some of those were afterwards sanctified, and consequently *ab origine* the elect of God, and not reprobates in such a sense as we entreat of it in this controversie.

Be it so, that men are not shut up in enmitie against Christ till they have the light: For, how could it be otherwise, seeing to bee an enemie to the light, and to hate the light, are but one thing, though expressed under different phrases. What is this to the purpose? Say they are not condemned till then; I say nor then neither; 1. Unlesse they continue finally therein: for were not the very Elect sometimes strangers and enemies? *Rom.* 5. 10. *Col.* 1. 12. Be it so, hatred of the light goeth before condemnation, therefore the consideration of this hatred goes before Gods purpose to condemne them. If this Logick likes you, like this also: Faith, repentance, and good workes, goe before salvation; therefore they are before Gods purpose to save them whom he saves. But, whereas you seeme to denote, that after a certaine continuance in hatred of the light, a mans case is desperate, which you seeme to signifie by a phrase of shutting up; besides that it is nothing at all to the present purpose, but matter of another question, I shall believe it, When I finde your selfe, or any man else, to prove it: In the meane time I continue as I am, and rest contented with the

reasons formerly mentioned for the disproving of it. Undoubtedly, by the seed of the serpent, cannot be meant all men fallen and corrupted in *Adam* by originall sinne, for they are expresly proposed in opposition to the seed of the woman: *Gen.* 3. 15. Herein I concurre with you, but I concurre not with you in the description of the seed of the serpent; for that agrees to all, even to the Elect, as well as to the Reprobate: before the time comes, that God hath appointed for their effectuall calling; for till then, they have the Image of the old serpent (as you call it) stamped upon them: for they are in blindnesse of minde and hardnesse of heart, which undoubtedly are the chiefe workes of the devill, which Christ came into the world to loose. Their will is to doe the lusts of the devill, for the devill workes in them, and being taken in his snare, they are led captive by him to doe his will; yea *Paul* himselfe had an hatred of the light, and loved darknesse above it. But assure your selfe, no hatred of the light, except it be finall, is the cause why our Saviour shuts any man under condemnation. *I verily thought with my selfe* (saith St. *Paul*) *that I ought to doe* Act. 26. 9. *many contrary things against the name of Jesus of Nazareth.* 10. *Which things I also did in Jerusalem; for many of the Saints did I shut up in prison, having received authoritie from the chiefe Priests, and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them.* 11. *And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange Cities.* I see no reason why the prophanenesse of *Esau* should stand in greater opposition unto grace, then the zeale of *Paul* while he was a persecuter. *Esau* intreated *Jacob* kindly in his returne from *Mesopotamia*, but *Esau* continued finally in his prophanenesse. *Paul* continued not in the course of his blind persecuting zeale; and this puts the true difference between them. Though with God there was a difference put between them from everlasting in his counsels, to make the one a vessell of mercy, the other a vessell of wrath. And I see no reason why the reprobates should not be accounted the seed of the serpent from their first conception: not because of their originall pollution (for that is common to them with Gods Elect) but because God doth not purpose to cure it in them, as hee will cure it in the Elect; though this naturall corruption cannot break forth into actuall hatred of the truth, till they were brought acquainted

with

with it: and the like actuall hatred breakes forth also in Gods Elect, as it did in *Paul*, untill the time comes which God hath appointed for the curing of it: But hee will never cure it in the Reprobate.

Against the point I know nothing of worth, besides that in the Rom. *interpreted and opened in the answere to the fourth Doubt following; save onely that place in* Jude, *where it is said of the false teachers (as it is commonly translated) that they were* ordained of old to condemnation. *The words in the originall are;* πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα. *The sense whereof is given to be, that these false teachers were of old ordained to judgement.* viz. *As they take it from eternitie, and so before themselves were, or had given any former cause of such condemnation: and according to this sense, the subject whereabouts the decree of reprobation is conversant, is not the world as fallen in* Adam, *much lesse as fallen from Christ: but as considered in* massa pura, *before they had done good or evil, yea, before they were. To cleare this objection I am to crave leave to depart from the usuall translation and interpretation of this place. For first,* κρίμα *doth not in the first place signifie condemnation, but, as you well know, judgement rather. And so if I should give the sense, they were of old ordained to judgement,* viz. *according to their workes; this would not at all touch the second act of positive Reprobation, the point now in hand; but only confirme the first point touching the former act of positive Retribution, spoken of before;* viz. *before the world was, God then ordained the men of this world to judgment according to their works. And surely I should have rested in this sense, but that I see the Apostle* Jude *interposing the Pronoune* τοῦτο, εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, *doth thereby point at some spirituall kind of* κρίμα, *or judgement spoken of by him in the wordes before.* v.3. *Hee thought it needfull* to exhort them to contend earnestly for the faith once given to the Saints. *In the* v.4. *Hee rendreth a just reason hereof from the antagonists which were crept in amongst them; and whom God himselfe, as the chiefe* ἀγωνοθέτης, *had designed and sent amongst them, to put them to this contention and tryall. For so the coherence requires this word* κρίμα *to be here translated; for* κρίμα *coming of* κρίνω, *which signifies* decerno, dimico, *to contend in law or warre; and then* judico, *and last of all* condemno; *doth first signifie*

Answ.

lis.

lis or ceremon, contention or tryall; and then judgement, and at the last hand condemnation. Thus, Paul takes this word in the first sense with Jude here, κρίματα for suits or tryalls, or contentions. There is utterly (saith hee) a fault amongst you, ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ' ὑμῶν, in that you have contentions, or suits, or tryalls, one with another. If you take the primitive sense of the word κρῖμα, and also consider the coherence of the Apostles words in this place, this will appeare to bee his native and true meaning; οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, who were of old designed to this contention: Yet for a little further clearing of the text, let me adde a word touching the sense of the other two words; προγεγραμμένοι οἱ πάλαι. In the word προγεγραμμένοι the Apostle alludeth to the common course of Judges, and suites in the law; or of wrestlings in the Olympian, or of captaines in the war, who were wont conscribere, to designe afore-hand, or set downe in writing the names of such adversaries as were to have their causes or tryalls tryed before them. And as for πάλαι, which signifies of old, I dare not stretch it so farre, as to reach it to eternitie; neither doth the place require it, nor any other in scripture to my remembrance. Yea, God himselfe, in Jeremy, plainly distinguisheth time of old, from eternitie; as the lesser from the greater. If you then aske what is that old time Jude here speakes of, wherein God wrought afore-hand, and as it were designed; viz. these false teachers to the tryall of his Church, and contention with him: I answere, About 4040. yeares before Jude wrote this Epistle, when God pronounced in Paradise that ancient curse upon the serpent and his seed, I will put enmitie (saith he) between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, then was that of old, when God did assigne and appoint these false teachers under these generall words, the seed of the serpent, to this enmitie, and contention with the Church, concerning the faith once given to the Saints. And indeed the description which Jude gives of these false teachers, thus set out by God unto this contention, doth plainly decipher them as the seed of the serpent; ἀσεβεῖς, ungodly men, turning the grace of God into wantonnesse, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus have I declared how farre, or rather how little I have departed, and upon what grounds, not so much from the received doctrine of our Church, as the received manner of the explication

cation of it. In all which I humbly submit my spirit, not only to the judgment of the reformed Churches, whether of England, *or of foreigne countries (if ever they come to take notice hereof) but also of every learned godly brother, into whose hands this discourse may fall.*

As for that place of *Iude*, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, *the sense* hereof (you say) *is given to be, that these false teachers were of old ordained to judgement:* viz. *As they take it from eternitie, and so before themselves were, and had given any former cause of such condemnation.* This you make the interpretation of the place given by others, and their doctrine accordingly: And the consequent thereof you make to be this; namely, *That according to this sense, the subject whereabout the decree of Reprobation is conversant, is not the world as fallen in* Adam, *much lesse as fallen from Christ, but as considered* in massa pura, *before they had done good or evill, yea, before they were.* Now I have diverse things to object against you in this. First, were I of your opinion in the point of Reprobation, I should utterly deny that there is any such consequent, that may be lawfully inferred from the former interpretation and doctrine: For, albeit men are from eternitie ordained to condemnation, and consequently before themselves were, or had given any former cause of such condemnation: yet, if when God did ordaine them hereunto, he did foresee, not only their fall in *Adam*, but their finall infidelitie and impenitency also, and thereupon did proceed to ordaine them to condemnation, as it is acknowledged on all hands at this day; both Papists, Arminians, and orthodox Protestants, your selfe onely (that I know) excepted: then surely herehence it will not follow, that *massa pura* should be the object of Reprobation, but *massa corrupta*; and that not in *Adam* onely, but with actuall sinnes, and that throughout the whole course of their lives all along, even until death. And I perswade my selfe, you also will be of the same opinion, if you give your selfe to a due and serious consideration of it; which might have saved you all this paines in straining a poore text to serve your turne in a miserable manner, and that most causelesly: For, certainely you feare in this place, where there is no cause of feare at all on your part. Secondly, why should you straine courtesie to acknowledge Gods ordination (which is no other then Gods decree) of men unto condemnation, to have been *Examin.*

from all eternitie? For, what Papist, Arminian, Lutheran, or orthodox Protestant (provided that he be learned withall) is found to deny this? Was it not one of the prodigious doctrines of *Vorstius*, to maintaine that Gods decrees are not eternall? whence it should manifestly follow, that God is changeable. For, if God should now begin to will that, which formerly hee willed not; this would introduce a change in God, as well as if hee should cease to will that which formerly hee willed. Can it be denyed, but that God did everlastingly foresee whatsoever should come to passe? If hee did, then he did from everlasting foresee the finall infidelitie and impenitency of every one that in such a condition departs out of the world. And why then should it not become God from everlasting to ordaine all such unto condemnation? Thirdly, who are they that interpret S^t. *Iude* in such a manner as you obtrude upon them? I cannot beleeve any is found so absurd. What? that προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα should signifie no more then ordaine to judgement! What shall become of τοῦτο then? a word in this place most significant? I perswade my selfe you cannot name one, the Author of so loose an interpretation. But let us consider how you carry your selfe in the clearing of it as you speak, which indeed is to raise a mist rather in the clear. κρίμα you say, in the first place signifies judgement; and, I say, neither doe they render it otherwise whom you undertake to confute. Yet, holding the translation here (as it were at bay without specification) it cannot stand with your interpretation; to wit, of *Gods ordaining men to judgement (in generall) according to their workes*: a judgement of mercy, in case their workes prove good; or of wrath, in case they prove evill, whatsoever you pretend to the contrary, but most improvidently. For, albeit the word judgement be generall, and indifferently appliable to either kind, yet, the Apostles phrase here, *this judgement*, τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, cannot be understood, and maintained in any such generalitie and indifferencie. And therefore you could not rest in this sense without much oversight as your selfe observe, and forthwith confesse. Therefore you proceed further to observe, that *the Apostle* v.3. *thought it needfull to exhort them, to contend earnestly for the faith once given to the Saints*. That is true. In the *v.*4, hee addes the reason hereof; that also is true in these words: *For there are certaine men crept in, of old ordained* εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα. And these men,

men you call Antagonists, hawking thereby after some congruitie to your interpretation following. And thirdly, you observe, that God designed them to somewhat: and the better to hold up the congruitie of your interpretation, you call God the chiefe ἀγωνοθέτης. And the thing whereunto God designed them, was (you say) *to put the Christians, to whom the Apostle writes, to this contention and tryall*: Where you leave the Greek, as no longer able to serve your turne; for it is not ἀγὼν, but κρῖμα, whereunto God ordained them. But yet (which is enough) you positively avouch that the coherence requires this word κρῖμα to bee so translated. This, I say, were enough if you could as substantially prove it, as you doe confidently avouch it. And yet I presume, you well know your selfe to have been the first that hath discovered any such pregnancie of the text; to goe as it were with child with any such sense and meaning. And therefore it behooves you to bring good cardes for the proofe of this your interpretation. Now before I come to examine your proofe, I say, that this interpretation of yours is farre more rash than that is which you impugne, by how much it is farre more rash (as *Arminius* urgeth against Mr. *Perkins* according unto truth) to say, that God from eternitie ordaines a man unto sinne, then, that from eternitie hee ordaines men unto condemnation: And *Piscator* concurreth with you in the issue, though he takes a different way. *Ad hoc judicium*, εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, *i. e.* (saith hee) *ad hanc impietatem, qua impietate commerentur, sibiq; accersunt judicium Dei*, i. e. *eternam condemnationem*: As much as to say, to this impietie, which is their condemnation; according to that of our Saviour, *Joh.* 3. 16. *And this is the condemnation of the world, that light is come into the world, and men loved darknesse rather then light, because their deeds were evill*; still holding the word κρῖμα to his usuall signification of judgement or condemnation. Now wee come to the consideration of your proofe: κρῖμα wee know, comes from κρίνω, which signifies, you say, first *decerno*, then *judico*, and last of all *condemno*. Be it so, hence you inferre, that κρῖμα doth first signifie *lis* or *certamen*, and then *judgement*, and at the last, *condemnation*; and thus *Jude* takes it here. If this were granted you, then *Judes* meaning must be this, *who were of old ordained to this contention*: But you render it in much different manner, thus; *who were of old ordained to put them* (good Christians) *to this*

contention. Something you plead for the libertie you take in tempering the word; but you doe not so much as endeavour to justifie the libertie you take in interpreting *Pauls* phrase, when you say, that *to ordaine men to this contention*, is, *to ordaine them to put Christians to this contention.* If you should diswade men from impatience, and, giving a reason hereof, should say, *For many wicked men there are of old ordained to this impatience*; would any of your Auditors understand you? But give we you leave to enjoy your interpretation of the phrase, let us see how you can justifie your interpretation of the word. The first reason is, *ab origine nominis*; as if the verbe κρίνω, did first signifie to *contend*, and thence you inferre that κρῖμα signifies *contention* in the first place. But you bring no Greeke Grammarian or Dictionarie to justifie either the one or the other; neither doe I thinke any world of words (as Dictionaries are sometimes called) doth justifie any such interpretation of κρίνω or κρῖμα. A matter may be determined by deeds (as by dint of sword) as well as by words, and legall debatings; so that *judicare* and *decernere*, as comprehended under κρίνειν, shall be still of the same moment, and nothing different in the effect, though *res* prove to be *judicata* different wayes. Secondly you say, that St. *Paul* takes the word κρίματα, for *contentions*: I finde by my Concordance that the word κρῖμα is found 28 times in the new Testament. Out of all these you have pickt out one to serve your turne, if that doth serve your turne; 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. *There is utterly* (saith he) *a fault among you*, ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, that is, say you, *in that you have contentions and suits or tryalls one with another. Calvin* renders it thus, *Iam quidem omnino delictum in vobis est, quòd judicia habetis inter vos*; keeping the word to his usuall signification: you will have it to signifie *contention*, as if by speciall providence it were here so used. For the better clearing of St. *Iude*, our English, both the last, and Geneva, thus: *Now there is verily a fault among you, that you goe to law one with another.* Now to goe to law, what is it but to seeke to civill courts for judgement or justice. Yet I am content to take your owne translation, whereby it is apparent, that by this word, is not so much signified *contentions* in generall, as *suites and tryalls* in speciall; like as *Piscator* renders κρίματα in this place, *controversias forenses*, to wit, by a Metonymie of the effect for the cause; for, where there are judgements foren-

secall,

secall, there must needs proceed controversies forinsecall. And as for contentions in generall, I doubt not but you well know, that in the new Testament they are usually denoted under the words ἔρις or ἐρίθεια. Now compare wee this with that of *Jude*, when the Apostle exhorts them, *v. 3. to contend* (under the word ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι) *for the faith once given to the Saints*, and that against those seducers and corrupters, the devills factors no doubt, *who goeth about like a roaring Lion, seeking whom he may devoure:* he doth nothing at all exhort them to such contentions as you call suits or tryalls, but rather unto a contention of resistance unto the practice of such who would corrupt them; of the same nature with the exhortation of *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 8. 5. Having told them of the devils going about like a roaring lion, &c. *Whom resist* (saith he) *stedfast in the faith*: And answerable to that of *Paul*, *Ephes.* 6. 12. *Wee wrastle not against flesh and bloud, but against principalities, and against powers, and against worldly governours, &c. For this cause take unto you the whole armour of God, that yee may be able to resist in the evill day; and having finished all things, to stand.* So that throughout, there is nothing at all that serves your turne for the countenancing of so strained an exposition, which yet (as before I shewed) is most causelesly undertaken. You proceed to a little further clearing of the text, or rather to the raising of more mists, especially in the interpretation of the word πάλαι. As for the allusion you finde in the word προγεγραμμένοι to the common course of Judges and suits in the law, or of wrastling in the Olympians, or of Captaines in the warre, who (as you say, but without any proofe) were wont *conscribere, to designe aforehand, or set downe in writing the names of such adversaries as were to have their causes or tryalls tryed before them.* I have no great edge to oppose it. But *Calvin* goes no further then scripture, to discover unto us this allusion: *Porro* (saith he) *hæc metaphora inde sumpta est quod æternum Dei consilium, quo ordinati sunt fideles ad salutem liber vocatur.* And *Revel.* 20. wee read of another booke besides the booke of life, wherein the deeds of wicked men are written, and is not there written (thinke wee) their condemnation also? As for the word πάλαι of old, I confesse there is no native force therein to extend it to the signification of eternitie: Nay, *Mar.* 15. 44. it is applyed to a very little time before; for *Pilate* demands of *Joseph* of *Airmathea*, that

came unto him boldly to aske the body of Jesus, *whether he were dead* πάλαι already; yet it is applyable even to eternitie, neither doth it signifie any definite time rising upwards. And, although this phrase *of old* be distinguished from eternitie, *Jer.* 31.3. yet it is not *Habac.* 1.12. And as the words are different in the hebrew, so neither of them is rendred by πάλαι in the greeke: but wee extend not the signification of it to eternitie by any force of the word, but from the matter whereof he treates, which is the ordination and decree of God, which every intelligent and orthodox Divine acknowledgeth to be eternall; and I finde it wondrous strange so worthy a Divine as your selfe should be of any other opinion. And, I pray, why might not this designation be from eternitie, as well as 4040. yeares before, such ungodly men were crept in amongst the people of God? Belike not till then was the divell assigned to be an enemie to the woman; for it is expresly said, *God would put enmitie betweene the woman and the serpent, betweene the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent.* Surely, that place onely signifies what Gods eternall purpose was in this particular, then breaking out and manifesting it selfe; not that then the Lord did begin to ordaine it: For, nothing in the nature of God is temporall. And, certainely the enmitie of the serpent against mankinde had broken out before this.

Amongst others, I am one into whose hand this discourse of yours is fallen at length, having heard some inckling of it in the generall before; and truly by accident I lighted upon it, without any enquiring of mine, without any others offering it unto me; and I am sorry to see the scandall and offence that is given thereby unto Gods people in the way of truth: and that as I seeme to have just cause to suspect, some have been hardned and confirmed in their errour; and some, I heare, doe boast of this discourse of yours, as no small credit and reputation to their cause: yet, I am perswaded, this is no judgement of God upon you, who are far from any heretical animositie: onely we all know but in part, and the best are obnoxious unto errour; but the judgements of God that have their course in these dayes doe astonish me, in giving men over to illusions to believe lies, by what meanes, and after what manner he thinks good; and all because we doe not embrace the truth, the precious truth of God with love, thereby making our selves most unworthy of it. For, when in vouchsafing unto us his holy truth,

he

he doth as it were cramme us against our appetite, is it not high time for him to make us fast?

And amongst them of our selves, onely this let me adde; be- Answ.
cause, verum & bonum convertuntur, *every divine truth is rich in profitable use: I have been confirmed in this truth, by the holy usefulnesse thereof to all sorts.*

1 *To the Elect it maintaineth and cherisheth the freenesse and* Use 1.
largenesse of the riches of the grace of God to them, whose salvation he carrieth along in all the wayes of it, not according to their works, but according to his purpose and grace given them in Christ before the world was; under whom also are spread the everlasting armes of Gods almightie power and eternall love to guide and preserve them to his heavenly kingdome; which grace to us is so much the more magnified, when wee behold the severitie, and yet equitie, of his justice towards the world of mankinde; who though hee love them as his creatures, yet he dealeth with them according to their workes, which in the end windeth up in their woefull and just destruction.

2 *To the carnall Christian, that sinneth of ignorance or hu-* 2.
mane frailitie, and not of prophane and wilfull contempt of the meanes and wayes of grace, this doctrine offereth a serious exhortation to them to seeke after Christ whilst hee may be found, and earnestly presseth on him those lively and quickning expostulations of the Prophets, Why will you die, O house of *Israel?* What could I have done more for my vineyard, that I have not done? Turne yee, turne yee, that iniquitie may not be your destruction.

3 *To the prophane and malignant dog and swine, that wallow-* 3.
eth in sensuall and worldly lusts, and snarleth against the meanes and wayes of his owne peace, and trampleth the precious ordinances of God under foote; to such this doctrine testifieth to their faces, that God is just in all that cometh on them, and his way equall: They loved the cursed wayes of sinne, and are fallen into them; they loved not the wayes of blessing, and therefore are they farre from them.

4 *To the Lutheran and Arminian, who refuse the excellent and* 4.
heavenly benefit of the sound and comfortable doctrine of Election, by reason of some hard saying which they observed in the unusuall manner of handling the opposite decree of Reprobation; to them this doctrine removeth such stumbling blocks out of the way,

as

as have hitherto turned them out of the way of truth and peace.

5. *5 To the cavilling froward ſpirit, this doctrine cutteth off all occaſions of reviling and ſlandering the orthodox truth of God, and againſt them cleareth the equitie of the wayes of God.*

6. *6 To all ſorts of men, yea, to men and Angels, it miniſtreth much matter of admiring and adoring the wonderfull riches of Gods grace to Chriſt the head of the Church, and in him to all the elect his members, the abſolute power of his ſoveraigntie in dealing ſurre otherwiſe with the world, the unſearchable depth of his wiſdome in the order and end of all his wayes, the unſearchable depth of his patience, bountie and long-ſuffering towards all men, and manifeſt equitie of his juſtice, even to thoſe who abuſe his patience and bountie to their owne perdition.*

Examin. I confeſſe this courſe of juſtifying, a tenet, by the uſefulneſſe of it, is uſually much made of by the Arminians; but I could never brooke it in any. This is a faire way to make a rule of faith unto our ſelves, and under colour of uſefulneſſe, to ſhape the doctrine of the Goſpel after our owne fancies: yet, I am willing to examine what here you deliver alſo in every particular. 1. As touching the firſt Uſe, I finde, you ſerve your turne with a manifeſt confuſion of the grace of vocation, with the grace of ſalvation; Thus: God of free grace ſaves in the one, in juſtice damnes in the other. But the compariſon you make is nothing congruous; For, it is ſo carried by you, as if in this dealing of God, the caſe were alike with mans dealing; as when a Judge amongſt many malefactors, equally guiltie of death, ſaves ſome, and damnes others. Theſe are nothing equall; for the one die in faith and repentance, the other die void of faith, and in the ſtate of impenitency. Therefore to help this incongruitie, you will be driven to fly to effectuall vocation: And indeed, before God doth effectually call ſome by ſuch a grace as he denies others, they whom hee cals were no better then others. But, let us make way for the truth to appeare in her proper colours, by diſtinguiſhing thoſe things which ought to be diſtinguiſhed, leſt wee be found to be in love with our owne errours.

As touching Vocation; 1. we acknowledge with you, and you with us, the freeneſſe of Gods efficacious grace beſtowed on ſome, and denyed to others, and herein magnified; that whereas God might have beſtowed it on others, and not on them, he hath beſtowed it on them, and not on others; yea, on them who are

but

but few in compariſon, permitting a farre greater multitude of others, and which is eſpecially to be conſidered, though you are not willing to take notice of it: Like as God hath mercy on ſome in giving them this efficacious grace we ſpeak of, meerely according to the good pleaſure of his owne will; ſo he hardens others, denying them the ſame grace, and that meerely according to the good pleaſure of his owne will. And thus the freeneſſe of his grace is magnified towards the elect, by his ſeveritie and freeneſſe of his will in denying it unto others: whereas you ſo carry it, as if the freeneſſe of his grace to the one, were magnified in reſpect of his juſtice toward the world of mankinde, in dealing with them according to their workes; which is a plauſible ſpeech, and of common courſe uſually admitted, but utterly void of truth. The truth being this: That like as God, in inflicting damnation on men, doth not proceed according to the meer pleaſure of his own will, but according to the works of men; ſo, in denying grace efficacious, he doth not proceed according to the workes of men, but meerely according to the good pleaſure of his owne will. For, the Apoſtle plainely profeſſeth in this caſe, that looke how he hath mercie on whom hee will; ſo likewiſe he hardens whom hee will. And to cleare the truth in this point (becauſe as many as vary from the truth of God in this point, are not very prone to heare on this eare) let us conſider, that juſtice hath different acceptions. In a common notion it is no otherwiſe taken then for *juſtitia condecentiæ*, as the Schoolemen call it. Thus, whatſoever God doth is an act of Gods juſtice, whether it be an act of power, as in makeing the world out of nothing, or an act of liberalitie, in doing good to the creature without cauſe, or an act of mercy in pardoning ſin; all theſe are acts of juſtice in this ſenſe. The meaning whereof is no more but this: In all theſe actions God doth no other thing then what himſelfe hath lawfull power to doe. In this ſenſe it is juſt with God, as well to have mercy on whom he will, as to harden whom hee will. And ſo your compariſon here made, ſhould have no life at all to that purpoſe whereunto you accommodate it. For, in this ſenſe the juſtice of God ſhall equally appeare on both ſides: Whereas you make the freeneſſe of Gods grace only on the one ſide to be magnified the more, by the conſideration of his juſtice, which hath courſe on the other. So that to hold up your

owne comparison as decently proposed, you must be driven to forgoe this common notion of justice, and sticke to a more strict and peculiar notion thereof; and that is, when God rewards or punisheth men according to their workes. Now, I say, that God doth not deny efficacious grace to any man according to his workes; which I demonstrate thus: The execution of justice in this kinde, doth alwayes proceed according to some law, which law is made to man by some superior power; but unto God not by any superior power (for hee acknowledgeth no superior power) but by his owne will: As for example, Wherefore doth God crowne all them with glory who die in faith, and in repentance? To wit, because he hath ordained and made a law, that, *whosoever continueth to the end* (in the state of faith and repentance) *shall be saved.* Againe, why doth God damne them to everlasting fire who die in sinne, void of faith, void of repentance? To wit, because God hath ordained and made a law, that, *whosoever beleeveth not* (provided that he continueth in unbeliefe unto the end) *shall be damned.* For, undoubtedly, God could have turned men into nothing, had it so pleased him, and had hee not decreed the contrary; like as hee brought men out of nothing. Now shew me that God hath ordained or made a law, that men found in such or such a condition shall be denyed efficacious grace: if you cannot shew any such ordinance or law of God, then doe not say that God, in denying grace, proceeds according to mens workes in justice. And, indeed, if any such law could be assigned, it would follow, that in the communicating of grace also God should proceed not according to the good pleasure of his will, but in justice, according to mens workes. Consider a second argument, What is sinne originall, but the spirituall death of the soule? By Regeneration man formerly dead in sinne is revived. Now is it congruous to say, that because man is dead in sinne, therefore it is just with God not to revive him? Because a man is blind, therefore it is just with God not to open his eyes? Or, because he is deafe, therefore it is just with God not to open his eares? Suppose sin were but the sicknesse of the soule, is it congruous to say, that because a man is sicke, therefore it is just with God not to cure him? Whereas it is manifest, that unlesse a man were first sicke, it were impossible to cure him; unlesse first blinde or deafe, it were impossible:

to reſtore ſight or hearing unto him; unleſſe firſt dead, it were utterly impoſſible to revive him.

Come wee now to ſalvation and damnation; you ſeeme to ſay that God of his free grace doth ſave a man. In my judgement it is an improvident ſpeech. For, conſider, whom doth God ſave of ripe yeares? Doth hee ſave any other but thoſe that die in the Lord? That is, ſuch as die in the ſtate of grace, in the ſtate of faith and repentance? Now judge, I pray, Is it fit to ſay, It is free and indifferent with God, either to ſave or damne them who die in the Lord, in the ſtate of grace, in the ſtate of repentance? For, hath not God made as well ſuch a law, that, *whoſoever beleeves and repents, he ſhall be ſaved?* As ſuch a law, *Whoſoever beleeves not, nor repents, ſhall be damned?* And, in reſpect of the former law, is not God as much obliged to ſave them that beleeve and repent, as in reſpect of the latter law, hee is obliged to damne them that beleeve not, that repent not? So that the compariſon is miſerably to blame, made between the freeneſſe of Gods grace in ſaving the one, and his ſeveritie and juſtice in condemning others: And the confounding of effectuall vocation and ſalvation on the one ſide, and obduration with damnation on the other, hath expoſed you to this incongruitie ere you are aware. So that, whereas I thought to have leaſt to doe about this uſe, a greater buſineſſe is made unto me in clearing the truth of God herein then I could imagine: and yet I am not come to an end. This may ſuffice to diſcover the unſoundneſſe of the maine body of your compariſon. But there are ſome other things to be conſidered on the by: Firſt, by way of amplifying *the largeneſſe of the riches of the grace of God.* You tell us how *the Lord carrieth the ſalvation of his Elect in all the wayes of it, &c.* And forthwith by way of addition you ſay, that *under them alſo are ſpread the everlaſting armes of Gods power and eternall love, to guide them to his eternall kingdome*: Which is no different thing, but meerely the ſame with the former, of *carrying their ſalvation along in all the wayes of it.* Theſe expreſſions, I confeſſe, are momentuous, to ſtir up gracious affections in the apprehenſion of the freeneſſe and power of Gods grace. But, if hereby our judgement (in the meane time) is not a little diſturbed

in diſcerning Gods truth, ſo that wee embrace errour in ſtead thereof, wee ſhall buy good affections at too deare a rate, as is the loſſe of truth. And hereby as I have ſhewed, the freeneſſe of Gods grace is miſerably weakned: For, if God be not acknowledged freely and of the meere pleaſure of his will to deny grace unto ſome, I cannot ſee how well it can be maintained that hee doth freely and according to the meere pleaſure of his owne will beſtow it upon others. Againe, that phraſe of yours, *the equitie of Gods juſtice* toward them that are damned, ſeemes ſomewhat incongruous. For, equitie ſignifies the moderation of juſtice in ſuch ſort, that the ſtrictneſſe thereof may not hinder mans good: But what good the damned reap by this equitie you ſpeak of, you have not declared. Laſtly, you ſay, *God loves the damned as they are his creatures.* And it is a phraſe, I confeſſe, that hath its courſe with many hand over head. In the very ſtate of damnation in hell fire, they are and ſtill continue to be his creatures; what, I pray, is that love of God that paſſeth upon them in that ſtate? Undoubtedly, whatſoever it be, it muſt conſiſt with hatred in the higheſt degree. I would willingly know whether it be *Amor complacentiæ*, or *Amor beneficentiæ*. If it bee *complacentiæ*, what is it that God likes in them, unleſſe it be his own worke, the nature of men? Or what good is it that God doth unto them in the ſtate of damnation? Can it be any other then the continuance of their being? Yet, moſt thinke that is nothing good to them in the ſtate of damnation. Whatſoever your meaning be, if you did expreſſe it, it may be you would fly from your owne caution in this place, as *Moſes* did from his rod when it was turned into a Serpent. I am perſwaded, the apparent incongruitie thereof would little pleaſe you. I come to the Conſideration of the ſecond Uſe.

2 That the doctrine of our Church, from which you ſwerve, doth not offer, as well as yours, *to carnall Chriſtians a ſerious exhortation to ſeeke after Chriſt whilſt he may be found:* Or that it doth not, as earneſtly as yours, *preſſe upon them thoſe hearty and quickning expoſtulations of the Prophets: Why will yee die, O houſe of Iſrael?* Or, *What could I have done more for my vineyard that I have not done? Turne yee, turne yee,*

that iniquitie may not be your deſtruction, you doe not ſo much as goe about to prove. But I have ſomething more to except againſt this uſe of yours. The deſcription here given by you of a carnall Chriſtian; to wit, *That hee ſinnes of ignorance and humane frailtie, and not of prophane and wilfull contempt of the meanes of grace*; I had thought it had been proper to the regenerate, and not at all belonging to the carnall Chriſtians, whom, I thinke, you make no better than naturall men, *to whom the things of God are fooliſhneſſe*; and in whom τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς *is enmitie unto God*, in ſuch ſort, that *they are not ſubject unto the law of God, nor can be*. But, I preſume, you ſpeak this of civill and morall Chriſtians, conforming to the meanes of grace, and not giving any outward evidence of contemning them. But, herehence it followeth not, that God who ſeeth their hearts, finds not prophaneneſſe in them, or vile eſtimation of the meanes of grace. But howſoever, whether they are prophane or formall, wee exhort all, wee preſſe the ſame expoſtulations upon all: and dare you ſay, that never any prophane or wilfull contemner of the meanes of grace is converted? Though that theſe expoſtulations doe quicken any, it is meerely of the ſpirit of God, *who bloweth where hee liſteth*. But, whereas you ſeeme to imply (though you are not willing to deale plainly, and expreſſe ſo much) that a carnall Chriſtian, ſuch as here you have ſhaped him, hath power to yeeld to theſe exhortations, and quickning expoſtulations; a point that we dare not take hold of, without much explication: For, to yeeld unto them in a gracious manner, I conceive, to be utterly out of the ſphere of a naturall man, or a carnall Chriſtians activitie: And, I preſume, you will affirme as much; but to yeeld unto them, either hypocritically, either according to the courſe of groſſe hypocriſie, or of that hypocriſie which is ſecret to him that is poſſeſſed with it, or, *ad exteriorem vitæ emendationem*; wee deny not ſuch a power unto a carnall Chriſtian as you deſcribe him, nor unto any prophane perſon whatſoever. And, I am perſwaded, it is onely a conſideration of things in generall, and in a confuſaneous manner, holds you on to imply ſuch a power in car-

nall Christians: Whereas if things were distinguished aright, it would more easily appeare what is within the region of nature, and what beyond it, as meerely imputable to the speciall grace of God, and operation of his spirit.

3 As for *dogs and swine*, wee are forbidden *to give our holy things, or to cast our pearles before them at all.* And therefore are wee not to trouble our selves, in considering to what end this doctrine is to be preached unto them. And yet, as for the testifications proposed as proper unto them, it is nothing so; for not to them only, but to carnall Christians also doe such belong, yea, to the very Children of God also; to wit, *That God is just in all that cometh on them, and his wayes equall.* As when after *Davids* foule sinnes in the matter of *Uriah*, the sword pursued his house, and *Absolon* defiled his fathers concubines, and hee was driven to flie from *Jerusalem*, and *Shimei* meeting him on the way cursed him, &c. And, I pray you, what unregenerate man throughout the world doth not love the cursed wayes of sin, in some kind or other, though not in all kinds? And no marvell, for vice is like a pike in a pond, it devoures both vertue and lesser vices: One vice is opposite to another, and not onely unto vertue: And therefore, no mervaile if no man be found vicious in all kinds.

4 As for the *Lutheran* and *Arminian*, you professe, that this Tenet of yours *removes such stumbling blocks out of their way, as have hitherto turned them out of the way of truth and peace.* But what these stumbling blocks are, which you have removed, I know not. It seemes this hath been a chiefe inducement unto you, to decline from that which you confesse to be the most received opinion of our Church, and to shape unto your selfe a new forme of opinion different from that which is received, (if not to remove some stumbling blocks out of your owne way.) Now, if it be so, the fairest course had been to have expressed what these offences are; Secondly, how our most received Tenet doth either cast them in the way of others, or at least doth not remove them; and thirdly, to shew how by this opinion of yours they are removed: But none of these have been performed by you.

Againe,

Againe, Mr. *Moulin*, being very orthodox in the point of Election, as you are, varieth from us, as you doe, in the point of Reprobation; maintaining, Reprobation to be instituted upon the foresight of mans finall impenitency, in his *Anatome Arminianismi*. *Corvinus* an Arminian, hath taken him to taske in a worke of his, and is never a whit the more forward to concurre with us in the point of Election, because *Moulin* concurres with them in the point of Reprobation. Nay, what doe Papists say about *Durham*, by occasion of our complying with them, but this, They need not comply with us, for wee come fast enough forwards to comply with them. And more then this, I have already shewed, that this tempering (or corrupting rather) of the doctrine of Reprobation, maketh a faire way for the utter overthrowing of that which you call *the sound and comfortable doctrine of Election*. Forasmuch, as looke by what reason you maintaine the foresight of finall impenitencie and infidelitie to goe before Reprobation, as it signifies the punishing with everlasting death; by the same reason it will appeare, that the foresight of finall perseverance in faith, repentance, and good workes, must necessarily goe before Election, as it signifies Gods decree of rewarding with everlasting life. In which notion alone, election or the decree of salvation, is contrarily opposite to reprobation, or the decree of condemnation. For, in maintaining that Reprobation, as a purpose of God to condemne for sin, doth presuppose the foresight of sinne, you doe thereby imply that Election, as a purpose of God to reward for righteousnesse of faith and repentance, doth presuppose the foresight of faith and repentance. But, if your meaning be no other than this, that God hath ordained no man unto damnation but for sinne, what offence or scandall doe you, remove hereby, which wee doe not remove also, who concurre with you herein. And, which is more, wee are ready not onely to affirme, but to make good also, that in no moment of nature doth the purpose of Condemnation goe before the foresight of sinne, even of that sinne for which men shall be damned: Whereas you, in maintaining that the foresight of sinne is precedent to the purpose of condemnation, doe con-

able

able to make it good; but must necessarily fall foule upon a manifest contradiction to your owne rules: For, if the foresight of sinne be precedent to the decree of condemnation, then God did first decree to permit sinne, before hee did decree to damne for it: And herehence it followeth that permission of sinne in Gods intention, was before condemnation; and if it were first in intention, then, by your owne rules, it must be last in execution; that is, men shall be condemned for sinne, before ever they be permitted to sinne. Nay, I appeale to your owne conscience, whether wee doe not open a fairer way for composition in the point of election, then you doe in the point of Reprobation. Considering that like as in Reprobation, Gods decree to condemne, is in no moment of nature precedent to Gods foresight of sinne; so in Election, I am bold to affirme, that Gods purpose to save is in no moment of nature before his foresight of faith, repentance, and good workes, and finall perseverance in them all. Will not you thinke, that you have cause to feare hereupon, that I am more dissolute in the point of Election, than rigid in the point of Reprobation? Yet if you will confesse, that herein is a faire way opened for composition in the point of Election; I dare undertake to perswade you, that this shall be maintained without any prejudice either to the freenesse of Gods grace, or to the absolutnesse of his power. The truth is, our Divines have a long time erred in making different decrees of those which are but one (I mean formall) decree, to wit, of the meanes, though materially different, which is nothing strange: For, why should it seeme strange that many meanes should be required to the same end? Wee commonly say, that Gods decree to give salvation is the decree of the end; and his decree to give faith and repentance is the decree of the meanes: yet they dare not say commonly, that Gods decree to inflict damnation is the decree of the end; and Gods decree to deny grace is the decree of the meanes: And so they are driven to overthrow all Analogie between Election and Reprobation. I say that Gods decree of giving faith and salvation unto sinners, are but one formall decree of God concerning the meanes; the end whereof is, the manifesta-

manifestation of Gods glory in the way of mercie mixt with justice. And, indeed, nothing can be the end of Gods actions but his owne glory; for hee made all things for himselfe, and as all things are from him, so all things must be for him; for the supreame efficient must be the supreame end. Now if God at once, and in one moment of nature, decreeth to give salvation by way of reward of faith, judge you, or let any indifferent Reader judge, whether this decree of salvation be not necessarily conjunct with the forsight of faith.

5. As for the *occasions of slandering and reviling the orthodox truth of God*, which as you conceive, this doctrine of yours turneth of to the *cavilling and froward spirit*; you have not so much as expressed what they are, much lesse justified them, to be such occasions as you speak of, or shewed how they are removed by your doctrine, and not by ours. In like sort, what is that equitie of the wayes of God, the credit of the clearing whereof, you attribute to your owne doctrine, and derogate from ours, you take no paines to explicate. If your meaning be, that you maintaine, that God condemnes no man but for sinne voluntarily and freely committed by him, and withall doe obtrude upon us the contrary, you doe us the greater wrong, provided you speak of men of ripe yeares. As for the damnation of infants, I doubt you feare so much to offend men, that you come too neere the *Pelagian* and *Arminian* tenet hereabouts. And if you thinke there is any active power in a naturall man to believe and repent, wee will not feare offence to resist you, or any man in this, the scripture having so plainely expressed the contradictorie to this; 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. and *Rom.* 8. 8. Or, if your opinion be, that God doth not harden whom he will, as well as hee shewes mercie on whom hee will; (where the good pleasure of God is as evidently signified to be the cause of the one, as of the other) wee shall not forbeare by Gods grace, through feare of offence, to resist you in this also. And if *Pharaoh* shall hereupon object and say, Why doth God complaine of my not letting *Israel* goe, when he himselfe hardens my heart, that I may not let *Israel* goe; wee

thinke it fit to take the Apostles course to stop such a ones mouth, and say, *O man who art thou that disputest with God, shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power, &c.* And let men take heed, they doe not take upon them to be wiser than the Holy Ghost, and thinke to satisfie men by devises of their owne, when the word of God doth not satisfie them. Yet, in all this, the Apostle doth not impeach the libertie of their wils, nor *Austin* neither, but rather justifieth it throughout; yet is hee bold to pronounce, that *libertas sine gratia, non est libertas sed contumacia.* As much as to say, a man without grace hath will too much to that which is evill, and averse from that which is good, as being wilfully bent to the one, and opposite to the other. And, the providence of God in the efficacie of working all things to his owne ends, compared with the libertie of the creature, hath ever been accounted of a secret nature; whereas now a dayes, nothing will satisfie the Patrons of free will, unlesse this secret and misterious providence of God, as it was wont to be accounted, come to be utterly overthrown, and libertie of the creature (if not chance) be brought to dominere in the place thereof. When you speak of the orthodox truth of God, I presume, you doe not distinguish of the truth of God as if some were orthodox, and some not. Yet, I confesse, *Epithites* have another use besides the use of distinction; yet, in this case also, the *Epithite* is not congruous, for orthodox is as much in effect as true.

¶ As touching the last, I presume, you will not deny, but that the *riches of Gods grace to Christ, and in him to all the Elect*, are by our Tenet acknowledged to be as wonderfull as by yours. As for *the absolute power of his soveraignetie in dealing farre otherwise with the world*, I presume, your opinion is, that wee doe exceed rather then come short of you in the acknowledging thereof: For, wee maintaine God to be as absolute and free, in the denying of grace to some, as in giving it to others. And by denying of grace, wee understand *the hardning of men*, at least as touching the chiefe part wherein it consists. Yet, this you will have to proceed not

so

of ripe yeares, but for sinne voluntarily and freely committed by them, and that in such sort as they might avoide it; speaking of any outward transgression; Onely it is not in their power to change their hearts, and to love God with all their hearts, and feare him, and depend upon him: Whence it commeth to passe, that albeit there is no particular, materiall, transgression, which they could not avoide, yet it is not in the power of a naturall man to avoid it in a gracious manner; and all for want of that love of God, before spoken of, which cannot be wrought in a man but by the spirit of regeneration. If any man should further object (as I wish you had objected, to the uttermost, against our Tenet) supposing

To the fourth Doubt.

HOw may it appeare that Gods hatred of *Esau*, is of a lesse degree of love, since the making of him who by birth is superiour, to be a servant to his underling, argueth no good will at all, but: 4 Doubt. Quest. 4.

First, rather a purpose to passe him by, in respect of communicating grace and glory.

Secondly, since the raising of *Pharaoh*, which was to this intent, to shew his power in his overthrow argueth the like.

Thirdly, since hardning is an effect of hatred, and depends on the will of God, as the first cause thereof, even as Mercy doth.

Fourthly, since there is no cause of that objection, why complaines hee? Who hath resisted his will? or at least of that answer, *Rom.* 9. 20, 21, 22.

I Answer, as *Iacob* preferring *Ephraim*, the younger brother to greater estate then his elder brother *Manasses* did not thereby declare a positive hatred of *Manasses*, but a lesse degree of love to him in comparison of his brother: Answer.

So Gods preferring *Iacob* to bee a superiour and Lord to his elder brother *Esau*, doth not argue that in him there is no good will at all to *Esau*, but a lesse degree of love,

To subject *Esau*, as a servant to *Iacob*, doth not reprobate *Esau*, but puts him into the condition of the world of mankind: who together with the rest of the Creatures are made to bee servants to the Church of the elect, and to the members of it.

But grant Gods hatred of *Esau*, and making him a servant to his underling, argueth no lesse then a purpose to passe him by, in respect of communicating glory unto him out of grace. And for my part thus farre I yeeld, that it may well argue a purpose of God to passe by him, in respect of communicating glory to him out of grace, that grace I mean, whereby hee hath made us accepted in his beloved: for this grace, or free love, is made *Iacobs* preheminence, and is denyed to *Esau*, and though it put him into the estate of a servant to his elect brother, and so

into the condition of the world of mankind, yet it doth not reprobate him, or argue a purpose to passe him by in respect of communicating life or glory at all unto him, but implyeth only a purpose to deale with him in justice, *viz.* to give him life or death according to his works, as I have already shewed in the answer to the former doubt, and shall have occasion more fully to declare it, in the end of this.

Exam. Surely *Iacob* in doing that which hee did to *Manasses* and *Ephraim*, did neither preferre one to a greater estate then the other, or love one lesse then the other. But in the spirit of prophecy fore-signifyed, what would bee the condition of each in their race and posterity. But suppose a father in that which lyeth in his power, preferres one son before another, and accordingly in that way of *Amor beneficentiæ*, bee said to love one lesse then another, will any sober man say, that hee loves the one, and hates the other; is this a decent expression of lesse love? We know full well, that a lesse love in the way of beneficence, may bee joyned with a greater love in the way of complacency: As for example, an earthly Father, though hee suffer his eldest Son to goe away with the Land, yet hee may bear greater affection to a younger sonne, though hee assigne unto him a farre lesse portion then to his elder brother. And if it were decent to say, hee hates him, whom hee loves lesse in respect of beneficence; then hee should bee said to hate him whom hee loves best.

Lastly, if the hating of *Esau*, bee interpreted lesse loving, why may not the loving of *Iacob*, by the same liberty bee interpreted the lesse hating of him.

Amongst Gods elect some are more beloved of God, and some lesse, according as hee ordaines one to greater grace and glory then another, and is it fit to attribute that to *Esau*, which wee attribute to Gods elect?

I grant that to subject *Esau* to *Iacob* as a servant, is not to reprobate him, for this subjection is made in time; But reprobation, as wee take it in opposition to election, *Ephes.* 1. 4. was made before all times. It is your own phrase, to distinguish the world of mankinde from the elect, as if the elect were none of the world of mankinde. For the very elect themselves are subjected as servants to the elect, every one unto others: though

though as great as *Paul* and *Apollo*, as appeares by the very place, your self have now in a contrary sense alledged more then once. And who doubts that wee must all serve one another through love, since Christ himself was content to wash his Disciples feete? Lastly, the yoke of *Esau* unto *Jacob* was at length shaken off, as appeares by *Isaacs* prophesie it should bee; but the yoke of subjection of all things unto the Church, shall never bee shaken off.

But you perceive well enough that the discourse which you answer, considered this temporall preferment (which yet had course onely in their seed) onely in a typicall manner, as that *which under temporall things prefigured spirituall*, and accordingly you proceed to shape your answer thereunto in that respect also. The same is this, *Though God had no purpose to deale with* Esau, *as hee dealt with* Jacob: *that is, to communicate glory unto him out of grace, yet hee had a purpose of communicating glory unto him some other way*; and what can that bee, but of communicating glory unto him, not out of grace? A very strange assertion, and therefore no marvell, you spared to set it down in so many words. Onely you say, that the putting him into the state of a servant, did not reprobate him, or argue a purpose to passe him by in respect of communicating life and glory unto him. Which to my judgement doth manifestly intimate that you acknowledge in God a purpose to communicate life and glory to *Esau*, some way or other.

And if you did acknowledge a purpose in God not to communicate life and glory at all unto him, this *Aquinas* confesseth, and wee joyntly with *Aquinas*, confesse that it is nothing lesse then to hate him. For if God will have a man to bee, and will not have him to bee saved, surely hee will have him in the end to bee damned. For in the end there will bee found no middle state, equally remote from salvation and damnation. But you doe in plain termes acknowledge a purpose in God to deale in justice with *Esau*, and to give him life or death according to his works. I presume you will not avouch this of all them that you account the world of mankinde. For I doubt not but you will except Infants. As for men of ripe years, is it not as true of the elect, as of those you call the men of the world, that they shall bee dealt withall according

to their workes? I doe not say according to their deserts, but according to their works, keeping my self to your own phrase. Hath not the Apostle professed, 2 Cor. 5. 10. That *we must all appeare before the judgement seate of Christ, that every man may receive the things which are done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evill?* But these works I confesse are different, for either they consist in obedience or disobedience; either to the Covenant of the Law, or to the Covenant of Grace; either to the Law of works, or to a Law of Faith. Now as for those whom you call the world of mankinde, and concerning whom you professe, God hath a purpose to judge them according to their works, I demand whether your meaning is, God wil judge them according to their works, in reference to the Covenant of the Law, or in reference to the Covenant of Grace. If in reference to the Covenant of the Law, then the meaning must bee this, God hath a purpose to save them, in case they perform exact obedience to his Law: But in case they continue not in every thing that is writen in the book of the Law to doe it, Gods purpose is to condemn them to everlasting death. Now I appeale to every sober Christians judgement, whether if God hath no purpose to save them, but upon condition of such obedience, and withall hath a purpose to damne them upon condition of such disobedience, whether, all things considered, it may not bee more truely avouched, that God hath a purpose to damne them, but no purpose at all to save them. If it bee spoken in reference to the Covenant of Grace, I dispute against it, first in the same manner. The conditions of the Covenant of Grace on mans part being *Faith* and *Repentance*, if God will not save them, but upon condition of *faith* and *repentance*, and will damne them in case of *infidelity* and *impenitency*; then surely if it shall bee found, that the men of this world are far more prone to infidelity and impenitency then unto faith and repentance, it followeth that God purposeth rather to damne them then to save them: But in case they are naturally carryed to infidelity and impenitency, and have no power to beleeve in Christ, and to break off their sinnes by true repentance; then it followeth as well in respect of this Covenant of grace (according whereunto God will deale with them) as in respect of the former Covenant of the Law, that

God hath no purpose to save them, but hath a purpose to damne them unto everlasting fire. But so it is of all those whom you call the world of mankind, namely, that they have no power to believe in Christ, or to break off their sinnes by repentance, but are naturally carryed on unto infidelity and impenitency, as I prove thus. They that cannot discern the things of God, but account them foolishnesse, they cannot beleeve in Christ: But such are all they whom you call the world of mankind, for they are not regenerate, and consequently they are meere naturals. Now *the naturall man*, as the Apostle speakes, *perceives not the things of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him.* Again, all such persons are still in the flesh. Now the affection of the flesh is enmity against God, is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can bee. Secondly, I prove that God cannot deale with them whom you call the world of mankinde, according to the Covenant of Grace: For if hee should, hee should save them all; as I prove thus. If whatsoever God requires by this covenant on mans part, God undertakes to perform on his part, then it is impossible but that all must bee saved with whom hee meanes to deale according to this covenant. But whatsoever by this covenant God requires on mans part, God himself undertakes to perform on his part, as I prove thus. First, in generall, God undertakes in this covenant, to bee our Lord and our God, to sanctifie us. Therefore, hee undertakes to give us faith and repentance. Secondly, in speciall, and first, doth God require at our hands, that wee should love him with all our hearts, and with all our soules? God undertakes to perform this. *Deut.* 30. 6.

1 Cor. 2. 14.

Rom. 8.

I will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy children, that thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soule. Doth God require at our hands that wee feare him? And God also undertakes on his part to work us unto this. *Jer.* 32. 40. *And I will put my feare into their hearts, that they shall never depart away from mee.* Doth God require Faith? this also on his part hee performes, *Act.* 2. ult. *God added to the Church daily such as should bee saved:* And *Philip.* 1. 29. *To you it is given to beleeve in him, and to suffer for him.* Doth God require Repentance? *Even to this end God sent his Sonne, to give repentance unto Israel, and forgivenesse of sins.* In a word, it is *God that*

makes us perfect unto every good work to do his will, working in us that which is pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, Heb. 13. 21.

Answ. But in the second place it may bee argued, that Gods raising up of *Pharaoh*, to this intent to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow, argueth the like hatred of *Esau* as of *Pharaoh*: viz. a purpose of passing both by, without communicating grace, or glory unto them.

To which I answer, a difference there is between *Esau* and *Pharaoh*; though not in their finall condition, nor in his purpose concerning them: Yet in the degree of their present estate, whereunto they were severally come, when God gave out his severall Oracles concerning them both: for hee saith not of *Pharaoh*, God raised him up to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow, before hee had done good or evill, as hee said of *Esau*, that hee should serve *Jacob*, before hee had *done good or evill.* The Hebrew and Greek word signifie neither to create, nor bring into the world, but to preserve, or to cause to stand, to stirre up, or to advance; which presupposeth *Pharaoh* already born, yea, and of such a Spirit; that if God preserve him and stirre him up, hee was become a fit subject upon whom God might shew his power in his hardning and overthrow. Otherwise God might as well bee said to condemn *Pharaoh* out of his absolute will, without all respect to sin, as to shew his power in hardning of him without all respect to sin.

Hardning, when it falls upon the creature, is both the height of his sin, and depth of his misery, and therefore is it as prejudiciall to Gods justice to inflict it without respect of sin going before, and to the creature as dangerous to undergoe it, as condemnation to hell it self. Hell hath no greater torment then an heart desperately hardned under the wrath, curse, and judgement of God, which was *Pharaohs* case.

But consider *Pharaoh*, not in the estate of *Esau*, as having done neither good nor evill; but in the state wherein he stood, when God gave out his Oracle concerning him, that *for this cause hee stirred him up, to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow*; and then may I easily grant more then is required. viz. When God purposed to passe by him, not only in communicating grace and glory unto him, but also to fall upon him

him in his utmoſt wrath, as well in outward ſtrange calamity, as eſpecially in ſpirituall judgements, hardneſſe of heart, and blindneſſe of minde to his utter perdition.

In the former part you declined a direct anſwer to the queſtion propoſed; for whereas the queſtion propoſed was touching the communicating of grace and glory, you not adventuring to maintaine a purpoſe of God to communicate grace and glory to them whom you call the world of mankinde, onely maintain a purpoſe in God (at leaſt you ſeem ſo to doe) of communicating life and glory ſome other way then out of grace. But with what advantage to your cauſe that hath been carryed, I have already conſidered. Now you ſeem to anſwer the queſtion, looking it directly in the face. For though you acknowledge ſuch a purpoſe in God concerning *Pharaoh*, to wit, of paſſing him by in communicating grace and glory, yet the cauſe (you ſay) is not alike of *Eſau*, when Gods Oracle was given out concerning him, (hee being not then born) as of *Pharaoh*, when the Oracle, here ſpoken of, was given out concerning him, hee being then a fit ſubject, upon whom God might ſhew his power in his hardning and overthrow. Yet here againe you decline the queſtion? For the queſtion was not, whether *Pharaoh* at that time when God ſaid, *For this cauſe I have raiſed thee up, &c.* were a fitter ſubject for God to ſhew his power in his hardning and overthrow; then *Eſau* was, while yet hee was in his mothers wombe. But whether God had not a purpoſe to paſſe by *Eſau* as touching the communicating of grace and glory, even before hee was born, which hee had concerning *Pharaoh* at that time before ſpoken of, which that hee had, I prove thus. It was ſaid of *Eſau* before hee was born, that God hated him. What more could bee ſaid of *Pharaoh*, to expreſſe his alienation from him? *Exam.*

Secondly, look how you qualifie the hatred of God to *Eſau*, in the ſame manner may it bee qualifyed towards *Pharaoh*, even at this time you ſpeak of. For Gods hatred towards *Eſau*, you qualifie thus: *God had a purpoſe to deale with him according to his works.* But ſay I, even then when God profeſſed of *Pharaoh* ſaying, *For this cauſe have I raiſed thee up, &c.* God had a purpoſe to deale with him according to his works.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, if therefore God had no such purpose towards *Esau*, (namely, to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow) because *Esau* was not yet born; then belike God had no such purpose towards *Pharaoh* himself, while *Pharaoh* was not yet born. But this is utterly untrue, for as much as Gods purposes are eternall, and not temporall.

And in like manner, it may bee proved, that if ever God had the like purpose towards *Esau*, to wit, after his preferring a messe of pottage before his birthright, or at any other time, it followeth that God had the same purpose towards *Esau*, even before hee was born, for Gods purposes are not temporall, but eternall.

Lastly, as for the difference you put between them, (besides the question) one being a more fit subject for God to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow then the other, I grant it to bee true in part, as touching the hardning of them. For obduration presupposeth a man of such ripenesse of years, as to have the use of reason: But this hinders not, but that God might at the same time have a purpose to harden him in his time, as *Pharaoh* in his time; And yet, why I pray was not *Pharaoh* as fit a subject for God to shew his power in changing his heart, as well as *Saul* was in the middest of his bloody persecutions of the Church of God? And what naturall man (such as I presume are all those whom you call the world of mankinde) is not a fit subject for God to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow, though hee bee never so morall, yea as morall as *Trajan*, who raised one persecution, or *Marcus Antoninus Philosophus*, who raised another, or as *Aurelianus*, who raised a third. It is true, if God will move any man unto courses contrary to his corrupt inclination, and not give him grace to master that corrupt inclination; that man whatsoever hee bee, shall bee a fit subject for God to shew his power in his hardning, yea, and overthrow also, if it please him. But if God move any man never so contrariously to his corrupt inclination, and withall give him grace to master that corrupt inclination of his, hee shall bee a fit subject for God to shew the power of his grace in his conversion and salvation.

You speak much of hardning, even according unto pleasure,

without

without giving your Reader any explication of the words, whereby hee might understand your meaning, wherein obduration consists. Surely, obduration is either the denyall of grace, or whatsoever it bee, it is alwaies joyned with the denyall of grace, as I take it. But in very different manner I confesse, which you distinguish not. As for the deniall of grace, that was found to have course in the first sin that was committed both in Angels and men. For I am of *Austins* minde concerning the Angels that stood, that they were *Amplius adjuti* then the other that fell, *De Civit. Dei. lib.* 12. *cap.*9. As also concerning *Adams* fall; that in that case, Though God gave him *posse si voluit*, yet hee gave him not *velle quod potuit*, and these hee makes severall *adjutoria*. The like may bee said of every sin that was committed, whereas God could undoubtedly restrain from the committing of it, and that either in a gracious manner, or in a meere naturall manner. When it is committed, his gracious restraint is not afforded, but denyed rather. What that other action is, wherein this obduration consists, and which is joyned with the denyall of grace, you expound not. Suppose it bee Gods moving a man to some course contrary to his corrupt nature, either by his word, as hee moved *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* goe, or by his works, or by the suggestions of conscience; according to that Law which is writen in mens hearts, is not this usually found also as often as sinne is committed contrary to light of Nature, or light of Grace? And hath not obduration consequently its course in all this? And why you should pronounce of obduration indefinitely, *That it is both the heighth of mans sin, and depth of mans misery*, I see no reason. Do not the children of God sometimes feele it, and in patheticall manner complain of it, *Lord why hast thou caused us to erre from thy wayes, and hardned our hearts against thy feare?* Esay 63.17. What saith our Saviour to his Disciples? Mark 8. 17. *Perceive yee not, neither understand, have yee your hearts yet hardned?* As for your phrase of *inflicting obduration*, that doth much require explication, which you doe no where perform that I know. There is I confesse another operation of God besides those I mentioned formerly; whereby men are given over by God, whence it followeth, that they will grow harder and harder, and that is the suspension

of his admonitions, either by taking away his word, or forbearing inward motives by his spirit, or removing his judgements and giving outward prosperity, whereby God is said *to give men over to their own hearts lusts*. But how this or any of these can bee called the *inflicting of obduration*, I understand not. And whereas you say it is prejudiciall to Gods Justice, to shew his power in hardning *Pharaoh* without respect to sin, like as to condemn him; I have already shewed the great difference between condemnation and obduration. It being never said, that God damnes whom hee will, but the Apostle plainely professing that *God hardens whom hee will*, even as expressely as it is said, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will*; and no marvell. For God hath revealed a Law, according to which hee proceeds in damning men, but you are not able to shew us a Law according to which God proceeds in the hardning of them. For if the elect before their callings, bee no better then reprobates, it is impossible to assigne a Law, according to which God proceeds in the hardning of men, but that by the same Law, the Elect of God must bee hardned also. And hardning in the Scripture phrase is usually opposed to Gods shewing mercy. It is one thing to speak of an heart hardned, another to speak of a heart desperately hardned. Yet if you were put to explicate your self, and shew what it is to bee desperately hardned, and that of God, and there withall to prove how *Pharaoh* was at the time you speak of, desperately hardned, I am perswaded this phrase would cost you more pains then you are aware of, for the satisfying of your self, and perhaps somewhat more for the satisfying of others. If then *God purposed to fall upon* Pharaoh *in his utmost wrath*, &c. Surely, from everlasting hee purposed so to fall upon him: for all Gods purposes are everlasting.

If your meaning bee onely to denote the precedency of such a condition of *Pharaoh* in sin, to Gods falling upon him, in bringing such judgements upon his back; but not a precedency to Gods purpose; I willingly concurre with you herein. But then the like may bee said of God concerning *Esau*, before hee was born, to wit, that God purposed to bring such a measure of obduration and confusion upon him after such a condition of sin. But if your meaning bee (as indeed hitherunto

unto the *genius* of your opinion drives you,) namely, that upon the foresight of some sinfull condition, God did decree to bring obduration and condemnation both upon *Esau* and *Pharaoh*, as this may bee said as well of one as of the other; here you will give us leave to dissent from you, considering how manifestly you are found herein to dissent from your self. For if such a foresight of sin goe before Gods decree of obduration and condemnation, then God did first decree to permit that sin, before hee did decree to harden and condemne man for it, so that the permission of that sin in Gods intention, must bee before obduration and condemnation, and consequently last in execution: that is, men shall first bee hardned and condemned, and then suffered to commit that sinne, for which they are hardned and condemned.

Again, if Gods purpose to punish with condemnation, must necessarily presuppose foresight of sin in God; by the same reason Gods purpose to reward with salvation must necessarily presuppose a foresight in God of obedience, and in this case, what shall become of the freenesse of Gods grace in election? not to trouble you with the profession of *Aquinas*, that *never any man was so mad as to introduce a cause of predestination, quoad actum prædestinantis.* The case is the same with introducing a cause of reprobation, *quoad actum reprobantis.* For the ground of this is, only because there can bee no cause of the will of God, *quoad actum volentis.* Now reprobation is well known to bee an act of Gods will, as well as predestination.

Answer, But say further, that this hardning of *Pharaoh*, bee an effect of the like hatred of *Pharaoh* as of *Esau*; neither is it said to depend on the sin of *Pharaoh*, but on the will of God, as mercy doth, as the first cause thereof.

I answer, this hardning of *Pharaoh*, though an effect of Gods hatred of *Pharaoh*, yet it is not an immediate effect of the like hatred hee bare to *Esau*, before hee had done good or evill, but presupposeth the sin of *Pharaoh*, *viz.* his malitious hatred of Gods Church comming between. God hateth no man so farre as to harden him, till hee hath fallen into some sin, in which, and for which hee may bee hardned. Hardning being alwaies (as far as I can perceive by Scripture) not only a sin, and cause of sin, but a punishment of sin.

How can God bee said to punish sin with sin, in hardning the creature, if sin in *Pharaoh* bee not presupposed to goe before the hardning? It is true indeed, this hardning of *Pharaoh* is referred by the Apostle to the will of God as the first cause thereof: For otherwise the answer of the Apostle had not been sufficient to the objection propounded, ver. 14. for there it was objected that unrighteousnesse might seem to bee found in God, even respect of persons to deale so unequally with persons equall, such as *Jacob* and *Esau* were; for if *Jacob* and *Esau* had done neither good, nor evill, when God had exalted the younger to the participation of his free love, and to soveraignty over his Brother, and depressed the elder to the condition of a servant, and as a servant reserved for him just dealing, but not fatherly love; might not this seeme an unequall partiality with God, to deale so unequally with persons equall? To resolve this doubt, the Apostle could not have cleered God from unrighteousnesse by pleading the sin of *Esau*, which deserved that hee should bee so dealt withall, for neither did *Jacobs* sin deserve better; and besides the Apostle had said before, God gave out these Oracles which pronounced his different respect of them without all consideration of good or evill in either of them; *viz.* before they had done either good or evill. Therefore to satisfie the objection, and cleare Gods righteousnesse, the Apostle wisely alledgeth testimonie of Scripture, to prove Gods absolute power and ability, to shew mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will to harden.

Exam. When you say this hardning of *Pharaoh*, though an effect of Gods hatred of *Pharaoh*, yet was not an immediate effect of the like hatred which hee bare to *Esau*, before hee had done good or evill, but presupposeth the sin of *Pharaoh*, your meaning seems to bee this, that it is not at all an effect of the like hatred which hee bare to *Esau*, before hee had done good or evill, yet it is no lesse then the not writing of his name in the book of life, as touching the communicating of saving grace and glory, neither do wee acknowledge it to bee any more; (like as *Aquinas* doth not) now the consequent of this kinde or measure of hatred in holy Scripture is no lesse, then the worshipping of the beast, *Rev.* 13.8. nothing lesse then the obduration

tion of *Pharaoh*. The obduration of the children of *Iſrael*, was no greater then ſuch as was conſequent unto this, that *God did not give them an heart to perceive, and eies to ſee, and ears to heare, Deut.* 29. 4. And this of *not giving hearts to perceive, &c.* undoubtedly, is a conſequent even to that hatred which you are content to attribute unto God, concerning *Eſau*. But you helpe your ſelf with a complicate propoſition, and flie to an immediate effect, which alone you deny in this caſe, for as much as the hardning of *Pharaoh* (as you ſay) preſuppoſed ſin committed by him, but very improvidently: For if it bee not an immediate effect of the like hatred that God bare unto *Eſau*, then in accurate conſideration it is to bee acknowledged an effect thereof. Only there is ſome effect thereof more immediate then this, and what I pray was that? was it *Pharaohs* ſin? for of no other doe you make the leaſt intimation; the more improvident is your expreſſion, intimating thereby that *Pharaohs* ſin was a more immediate effect in *Pharaoh* of the like hatred God bare to *Eſau* then this obduration.

But how doe you prove that *Pharaohs* hardening was not an immediate effect of the like hatred which God bare to *Eſau*? to wit, becauſe it preſuppoſed ſin. But I deny this Argument, neither doe you (diſcourſing at large) give your ſelfe to the proving of it; but onely ſuppoſe it. By the ſame reaſon you might ſay, that ſalvation is not the immediate effect of election unto ſalvation; becauſe ſalvation in men of ripe years preſuppoſeth faith, repentance and good workes.

Nay, you may as well ſay, that Gods giving of grace, is not an immediate effect of Gods love to any man; becauſe in moſt men of ripe years it preſuppoſeth many good works. In *Saul* it preſuppoſed his zeale and his righteouſneſſe according to the Law, which was unblameable. If you ſay that *Sauls* righteouſneſſe, whatſoever it was before his calling, was no fruit of his love: I may with more probability affirme, that *Pharaohs* ſin which preceded his obduration, was no effect of Gods hatred. If you ſay, that though ſuch righteouſneſſe in *Saul* was no moving cauſe to God to give him ſaving grace: In like manner I ſay, that no ſin in *Pharaoh* was a moving cauſe in God to deny him ſaving grace: For if it were, then either by neceſſity of na-

ture, or by the constitution of God. Not by necessity of nature; for undoubtedly God could have pardoned this sin of his, and changed his heart, as well as he pardoned the sins of *Manasses*, the sins of the Jews in crucifying the son of God, *Act.* 2. the sins of *Saul* in persecuting Gods Saints; and changed all their hearts. Nor by any constitution of God; for shew mee if you can any such constitution of God. And if you would but explicate wherein the hardening of *Pharaoh* did consist, I presume it would clearely appeare, that the meere pleasure of Gods will is the cause of it; like as it is the meere pleasure of God that he doth not harden others in like manner. But when we carry our selves in the clouds of generalities, we are very apt to deceive not others onely, (if they will be deceived) but our selves also. Againe, you seem to speake of *Pharaohs* hardening mentioned *Exod.* 9. 16. *And indeed for this cause have I appointed thee, to shew my power in thee, &c.* Whereas from the first time that *Moses* was sent unto him hee was hardened, and that by God, according as God had told *Moses* before-hand, that hee would harden him. As for his sin, before ever *Moses* was sent unto him, you doe not take any speciall notice thereof at all; but whatsoever it were, as suppose the cruell edict of his in commanding the male children of the Hebrews to be cast into the River; like as God answered him most congruously in his works; first causing the waters of *Ægypt* to bee turned into blood; and in the last place making the waters of the red Sea, the grave of *Pharaoh* and of his Host: was this horrible sin any lesse then a consequent to more then ordinary obdurations for even heathen men are seldom exposed to such unnatural courses. So that if this obduration were an effect of Gods hatred, but not immediate; supposing sin according to the manner of your Discourse; then you must be put to devise some other sin as precedent to this obduration. And whereas that sin also cannot be denyed to be a consequent to Gods denyall of effectuall grace to abstaine from sin, we shall never come to an end, till the cause of all these obdurations be at length resolved into originall sin. And what share I pray you hath the world of mankind therein, which Gods elect have not? When you tel us the hardening is a punishment of sin, it were very fit you should deal plainly, & tel us in what operation of God this work of hardening doth consist,

which

which I make no doubt, would cleare all. All confesse that God is not the cause of hardnesse of heart in any man, but man being borne in hardnesse of heart, *Ezek.* 36. 3. 1. God is said to harden, not *infundendo malitiam, sed non infundendo gratiam*: By leaving him thereunto, whereby it comes to passe that naturally it is increased, especially in case a man bee moved to courses contrary to his corrupt humours, whether by Gods word, or by his workes, and God doth not by grace correct those corrupt humours, which are so contrariant to good motions; good motions, I mean such as have their course onely in the way of instruction and perswasion; In this case thus to move and to deny grace is to harden. But when God doth forbeare thus to move, and gives men over to follow the swing of their own lusts, this I confesse is to harden in greater measure, and properly a punishment. But this was not the manner of *Pharaohs* hardning. For long after the ninth Chapter of *Exodus* wee read how God continued to admonish *Pharaoh* by his servant *Moses* to let his people goe; neither ceased hee this Discipline till the ten plagues or nine of them at the least were fulfilled. And like as to shew mercy is not to move onely to obedience, but effectually to work men to obedience, so the hardning of man in opposition thereunto, consists not in not moving unto obedience, but rather in not working unto obedience, although they bee moved thereunto both in the way of instruction and exhortation. As for the punishing of sin with sin, in the hardning of the creature, let us understand our selves aright, and not confound our selves when wee need not. Is it a sober speech to say that God punisheth his denyall of grace, with denyall of Grace? or that God punisheth the sins of the heathen with the denyall of that grace, which they never injoyed?

But as for the punishing of sin with sin, this is a large field of Gods providence consisting in divers kindes, and it is no way fit to consider them without distinction. God made the unnaturalnesse of *Sinacheribs* Sons, a scourge to chastise *Senacheribs* unnaturalnesse towards God; one mans sinfull act to bee the punishment of anothers. Here is one kinde utterly distinct from that you treat of.

Again, some say, (and I think justly) and *Austin* acknowledgeth it, that every mans sin may bee a just punishment unto him in respect of a former, as *Rom.* 1. 25. When men for their Idolatry were given over to vile affections, to defile themselves in abominable manner, it is said that herein they *received in themselves, such recompence of their error, as was meete.* So 2 Thess. 2. 10, 11. *Because men received not the truth of God with love,* God is said to *send them strong delusions, that they should beleeve lies.* Now seeing this concerneth the providence of God in evill, which is very secret, it were very fit that you should declare your opinion hereabout, and shew what operation of God it is, wherein consists the administration of this providence. When first, the one committed Idolatry contrary to the light of Nature, and the other received not the truth with love contrary to the light of grace: neither the one nor the other had any saving grace; and therefore, it is not decent to say that God exposed the one to doe things inconvenient, the other to beleeves lies, and herein punished them for their former misdemenour, by denying unto them that which they never injoyed. For to punish is either to inflict evil, which formerly they suffered not, or to withdraw some good which formerly they injoyed. Now how God doth expose unconscionable Christians unto errors of Faith, is easily comprehended. For whereas unconscionable Christians apprehend the truth which they doe injoy, but in a naturall and carnall manner, they may easily bee withdrawne from it, either by persecution or by seduction: Now it is in Gods power to send persecutors or seducers amongst them, and thereby expose them to the embracing of lies, for not imbracing his truth with love, or by withdrawing good Pastors and conscionable teachers from them: and then men being naturally more prone to errour then to truth, especially in matter of Salvation; wee see hereby apparently how God can punish sin with sin in this kinde, not by denyall of grace which they never injoyed, but by denying some outward means of grace which formerly they injoyed. And withall it appears that this is nothing to our present purpose, who treate of obduration, as it consists in, or is joyned with the denyall of saving Grace, in proper opposition to the shewing

of

of mercy, or affording saving grace. As touching the other examples wherein the administration of Gods providence is more obscure, while hee punisheth sin with sin; I say also that Gods punishing consists in denying, or not maintaining some kinde of grace, or rather not so much to bee called grace as a naturall restraint, not from sin in generall, (for that cannot bee but by saving grace) but from some sins in speciall, which are foule in the judgement of a naturall mans conscience, such as are those unnaturall defilements the Apostle speaks of *Rom.* 1. Now God in a naturall manner restraines men from such excesse, either for feare of shame of the world, or by reason of some naturall detriment that may arise thereby, or by the ministery of his Angels restraining the temptations of Satan in this kinde; And it is found by experience that *Nemo repente fit turpissimus*, but they grow to extreams by degrees, and the longer a man lives, the worse hee grows, if grace correct not the course of corrupt nature, according to that saying, *Nemo senex metuit Jovem.* Now if God shall forbeare this restraint, and give them over to the power of Satan, they shall bee exposed to the commission of such abominable things, and therein they shall receive in themselves a just recompence of their former errors. And therewithall wee see how this case is as extravagant from our present purpose in discoursing of obduration as the former. And you confesse that the hardning of *Pharaoh* is referred by the Apostle to the will of God; but withall you adde, that it is referred thereto, by him, as to the first cause thereof, whereas no such distinction or limitation sutable is expressed or implyed by the Apostle, but onely for the advantage of your own opinion, you are pleased thus to shape it. And it is very strange that the Apostle should utterly omit such a cause as is of a most satisfying nature, and give himselfe to the pleading of that, which affords so little satisfaction in the judgement of flesh and blood, such as it seems they relish most of, with whom the Apostle enters upon this his Dialogue, neither doth the Apostle referre this to *Jacob* and *Esau* onely, as you fashion it (to hold up the difference you put between Gods hatred of *Esau* before hee was born, and his hatred of *Pharaoh*;) but to the obduration of *Pharaoh* also, nay, more properly to that, his ob-

duration alone being expressed, and the Apostle being upon an answer to an objection arising from the Apostles Doctrine concerning Gods soveraignty and liberty to harden whom hee will.

Besides this, you doe not well to qualifie the difference God puts between *Jacob* and *Esau*, as if it consisted onely in making *Esau Jacobs* servant, and *Jacob Esaus* Lord; according to your opinion it extends further then this, even to the granting of such grace to *Jacob* as should bee accompanied with salvation, and denying of the same to *Esau*, whereupon infallibly followed condemnation. It is true, God is just in dealing with *Esau*, and God is as just every whit, in dealing with *Jacob*; for hee deales with each according to the Law himself made. But God shewed mercy also unto *Jacob* in providing a Saviour to die for him, and in circumcising his heart, and making him to perform the condition of like, hee shewed no such mercy unto *Esau*.

You see well how incongruous it were to plead the sin of *Esau*, why hee should bee so dealt withall, seeing *Jacob* at that time deserved no better. But why doe you not observe, that this Discourse of the Apostle, hath every way as pregnant a reference to the obduration of *Pharaoh*, or of any one that is hardned, as to Gods dealing with *Esau*?

Again, suppose some are not so bad as *Pharaoh* was, when God hardens *Pharaoh*, and doth not harden others, but rather shews them mercy, will you say the reason hereof is because these deserved better at the hands of God then *Pharaoh*? Doe you not perceive how this Doctrine carryeth you ere you are aware, to trench upon the freenesse of Gods grace in mans effectuall vocation? Suppose *Nicodemus* who fought to our Saviour by night were converted, and *Saul* had not been at all converted, but still hardned; would you have said that *Paul* was hardned because of his sin in persecuting the Church of God, but *Nicodemus* deserved better at the hands of God then *Saul*? Yet wee are sure that *Saul* in spight of all his persecution was converted, when in all probability many a morall Jew, and nothing factious in opposing the Gospel of Christ, yea and many a Gentile too were not converted, but perished in their sins, and in the blindnesse of their minde.

If it bee urged thereupon that God doth harden the creature and also hateth him with a positive hatred, without all respect of sin in the creature out of his absolute will.

Answer.

I answer, in these deep counsels and unsearchable wayes of God, it is safe for us to wade no farther then wee may see the light of the Scriptures clearing our paths, and the grounds thereof paving our wayes, and as it were chalking it out before us. The Scripture telleth us, *That God hardens whom hee will.*

Rom. 11. 1. 8. 9 10. compared with Psal. 69. 21, to 28. See also Rom 1. 26 27, 28 Psal. 81. 11, 12.

And again, sin is the cause in which, and for which God doth harden any: both which will stand together.

That as God sheweth mercy on whom hee pleaseth; so hee hardneth whom hee pleaseth, out of his absolute will. Yet hardneth none but with respect of sin going before. For,

First, when wee speak of the reprobate with comparison of the elect, they are both alike sinners: And therefore if the question bee, why God hardneth the reprobate, and doth not harden, but shew mercy on the Elect? Here no cause can bee rendred of this different dealing, but onely the will and good pleasure of God; sin is alike common to both, and cannot bee alledged as the cause of this diversity. *Idem qui idem semper facit idem.* But when wee speak of the Reprobates alone considered in themselves: If the question bee, why God is pleased to harden them; The answer is alway truely, and safely given; It pleased God to harden them for their sins. And which is yet more, when God is said to harden a wicked man for his sin, it is not sin that moved God primarily to harden him; but his absolute will it was to harden him for his sin; for what sin could God see in the creature to provoke him to harden it, but what hee might have prevented by his providence, or healed by the blood of Christ, if it had so seemed good to his good pleasure? When therefore God doth harden a creature for his sin, it is because it is his good pleasure, even his absolute will so to harden him. To will a thing absolutely, and yet so will it on this or that condition, may well stand together in many a voluntary agent, when the condition is such, as that the will might easily help, if it so pleased. As if a man should cast off a servant for some disease hee hath, which hee might easily heale if it pleased him:

him: or break his vessell for some such uncleannesse which hee could easily rinse out; Both these may well bee said of him at once, that hee cast off his servant for his disease, and brake his vessell for its uncleanenesse, and yet might hee cast out his servant and break his vessell, and both out of his good pleasure, and out of his absolute, and unbias free will.

Exam. It is true; the *Word of God is a Lanthorn unto our feete, and a Light to our paths*, and it is fit wee should rest contented herewith for discovering unto us the whole counsell of God. Now this Word of God plainly teacheth us, that *God hardneth whom hee will*. Rom. 9. 18. Now I presume you doe not doubt, but that God out of his absolute will, *sheweth mercy on whom hee will*. Nay, I can hardly believe but that your opinion is, that like as God out of his absolute will granted saving grace to *Jacob*: (or out of his absolute will he denyed saving grace to *Esau*. And still doth to those whom you account the world of mankinde.

And I have already shewed that the deniall of this grace can bee no punishment; For as much as punishment consisteth, either in inflicting evill, or in denying some good which formerly was granted them. But in denying saving grace to the world of mankinde, hee doth not deny them any thing which they formerly injoyed.

I have already shewed, what that hardning is which is for sin, and wherein it doth consist, not in denying saving grace, which they never injoyed, but in denying that naturall restraint from some foule sin, which formerly they injoyed, as I exemplifyed it in that, *Rom.* 1. 27. That in *Rom.* 11. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. is nothing for you, where there is no mention of sin as the cause of their obduration. As for that in *Psalm.* 69. 22. Their blinding is referred to their giving unto Christ *Gall in his meate, and in his thirst vinegar to drink*. I pray consider: Were they not even then blinded, when they persecuted Christ unto death? And yet notwithstanding some of these were converted, *Act.* 2.

But upon this their opposition unto Christ, God did proceed to blinde them more and more, but how? Not by denying saving illumination, for this they never injoyed, it was denyed them, from the first to the last.

But by withdrawing from them the meanes of illuminati-

on more and more, as namely the preaching of Gospel, and the working of miracles, and the giving them over unto the power of Satan. This also is *to give them over to their own hearts lust, Psal.* 81. 11, 12. by ceasing to admonish them of the error of their waies, either by his word, or by his judgements and chastisements in his works. That God doth harden out of his absolute will, and yet hardens none but for sin, cannot bee avouched in my judgement without manifest contradiction. If they are not contradictions; Then those also are not, *God hath mercy on whom hee will*, yet God hath mercy on none, but in respect of their good works going before.

Secondly, by the same reason it may bee said, that God condemnes men out of his absolute will, and yet hee condemnes none but for sin, yet you shall never read that God condemnes whom hee will.

Thirdly, if God doth harden out of his absolute will, then also hee did purpose to harden of his absolute will. Whence I infer that then God did not purpose to harden for sin. For Gods purpose to harden only in respect of sin, is commonly accounted (and that by your self) a will conditionate, and a will conditionate is opposite to a will absolute.

Lastly, I deny that God doth harden for their sins, as hardning denoteth a denyall of saving grace; For to harden for sin is to punish, but to deny saving grace to them that never had saving grace, is not to punish them; to leave a man in the state wherein hee findes him, is not to punish him. And therefore when *Epaminondas* ran his Javelin through a Sentinell whom hee found in sleepe, saying, I did but leave him as I found him, because sleep is usually said to bee *Mortis imago*, the Image of death, had hee no better Apologie for his fact then this, hee had no way freed himself from injustice. If God may harden man for sin, and yet sin shall not bee a primary cause moving God to harden him, by the same reason, though God condemnes man for sin, it is not necessary, that sin should bee a primary cause moving God to condemn him, which is directly contrary to your tenet in the point of reprobation. And this consideration of your own, if you hold your self unto it attentively, may bring you into the right way, from which you have erred, and the want of it hath been

been a meanes I feare to confirm many in their errors. Wee acknowledge it to bee Gods absolute will to condemne for sin, but withall wee say it is his absolute will to permit whom hee will to sin, and continue in sin, by denying saving grace to raise them out of sin. And this deniall of grace cannot bee for sin, as I have already proved. To harden a man, in opposition to Gods shewing mercy on him: wee take to bee nothing else then his refusall to cure him. Now let any man judge whether it bee a decent speech to say, that because a man is sick, therefore God will not cure him.

In the cases proposed by you, of casting a servant off for a disease which hee can cure if hee list, or breaking a vessell for some filthinesse which one may cleanse if hee will; whether this bee not to bee resolved into the absolute will of the Master, I am content to appeale to every sober mans judgement; although the comparisons are not congruous to the case wee have in hand; for as much as the casting of a servant off, is distinct from the not curing of him; the breaking of a vessell is distinct from the cleansing of it. But the hardning of a man, in opposition to Gods shewing mercy on him is nothing distinct from Gods refusing to cure him. If the question were proposed thus, Why will not a man cleanse his vessell when hee is able to cleanse it? why will hee not heale his servant when hee hath power to heale him? Is it a good reason to say, therefore hee heales him not, because hee is sick? therefore hee cleanseth not his vessell, because it is unclean? Neither is it a more solide speech to say, therefore God hardens a man because hee is a sinner; For it is as much as to say, therefore hee refuseth to cleanse him from his sin, because hee findes him unclean by reason of his sin.

Answ. The want of considering this point, hath as I conceive it, intangled the Doctrine of predestination with needlesse difficulties, and exposed it to rash and hard censures in the mindes of gain-sayers. Then it may bee said there was no cause of that objection, *Why complaineth hee, and who can resist his will?* nor at least of that answer to, *why doth hee yet complaine? Rom.* 9. 20, 21, 22.

I answer, that objection propounded by the Apostle, *Why doth hee yet complaine? for who hath resisted his will* doth not arise

upon occasion of Gods preferring *Jacob* before *Esau*, but upon the latter part of the Corollary going immediately before, *v.* 18. *Whom he will he hardneth*; for if it bee God that hardneth the creature, and that according to his absolute will, then might the hardned creature say, what fault is there in mee to bee so hardned? Why doth God complain of mee for my hardnesse and impenitency? *Who hath resisted his will?*

To make this objection colourable, wee need not say as you seem to imply, that the Apostle gave occasion of it, by ascribing the hardning of *Pharaoh* and other reprobates to Gods absolute will, and without all respect to sin; yet the creature hardned, is wont to plead with God about it, *Esa.* 63. 17. you shall there see Gods own people to erre, and upon their error, to have their hearts hardned from Gods feare, and both done by God, and yet the people expostulate with God about it, which if Gods own people may doe reverently, is it any wonder if the reprobates doe the same upon the same occasion petulantly and profanely?

But the answer of the Apostle to the objection propounded, cleareth the whole matter; For, as a man would justifie the severe proceedings of a Master of a Colledge, in refusing to elect an unworthy person, and in stead thereof expelling him the Colledge by pleading, first, the liberty or authority of his negative voyce: Secondly, the desert of the person refused and expelled: So the Apostle beateth down the insolency of the objection, and pleadeth the justice of Gods proceedings against Reprobates hated and hardned, from, first, the Soveraignty of God over his creature, *ver.* 20, 21. secondly, the due desertes of persons being vessels of wrath, and fitted for destruction, *ver.* 22.

What these needlesse difficulties are, wherewith the Doctrine of predestination is intangled, by the Doctrine of them whom you impugne, you doe not expresse, nor the hard and harsh censures which are passed upon it, that by due comparing of the one to the other, wee might examine how justly such censures are pronounced. *Exam.*

But of what nature your opinion is, how inconsistent in it self, on how little reason it is grounded, what consequences it draws after it, as also what causelesse fears you raise unto

to your self, and above all, and which is worst of all, how you deal with Scripture in this argument, to serve your turn, I leave it to your conscience to judge, not to mention how this Discourse of yours is found to harden many in the way of error, and to offend others in the way of truth.

Indeed there were no cause of any such objection as that, *Rom.* 9. 19. if so bee God hardens no man but for sin, and withall it is just with God to harden men in their sins, and lesse cause of such an answer, *Rom.* 9. 19, 20, 21, 22. No man, I think, makes any doubt but that the objection, *Why doth hee complain? for who hath resisted his will?* ariseth from the 18 vers. where it is said, that *God as hee hath mercy on whom hee will, so hee hardneth whom hee will*, even as hee hardned *Pharaoh*; but yet you do not shape the objection right, when you shape it thus, *What fault is there in the rebels hardned?* which is in effect as if you would shape it thus, Wherein then have I deserved to bee hardned? For the negative to this, namely, that God doth not harden upon desert, is that which the Apostle avoucheth. Like as neither doth hee shew mercy upon desert. But like as upon the meere pleasure of his will, hee shews mercy on some: So, according to the good pleasure of his will, hee hardneth others. But well might hee say, why then doth hee complain of the hardnesse of my heart, and my impenitency, or rather the Apostle proposeth it in reference to the fruits of mans hardnesse of heart and impenitency, such as God complains of, *Esa.* 1. *I have nourished and brought up a people, and they have rebelled against mee.* And Esa. 56. *All the day long have I stretched out mine hands to a rebellious people, that walk in a way which is not good, after their own imaginations.* Or as if *Pharaoh*, hearing of this ministry of Gods providence, should say, *Why doth hee complain of the hardnesse of my heart in not letting* Israel *goe, when hee hath hardned my heart that I should not let* Israel *goe, and who hath resisted his will?*

I have already shewed that this hardning of *Pharaoh*, and so likewise of all reprobates, as it consists in denying of saving grace, in congruous opposition to Gods mercy, proceeds meerely according to the good pleasure of Gods will: And the Apostle plainly signifies as much, when hee saith, That like as *God hath mercy on whom hee will*, so *hee hardneth whom hee*

will;

will; Neither doth hee take into conſideration any ſin of theirs as the cauſe of hardning, either in the propoſition delivered by him, or in anſwer to the objection ariſing there-hence. Why then ſhould wee bee moved with your bare word in ſaying, wee need not ſay that the Apoſtle gave occaſion of this objection, by aſcribing the hardning of *Pharaoh* and other reprobates to Gods abſolute will, and without all reſpect to ſin, as the deſerving cauſe thereof. Neither do you give any reaſon of that you avouch, in ſaying, that albeit God doth not harden but in reſpect of ſin; yet the creature will pleade or expoſtulate; as indeed it is moſt unreaſonable to ask why God doth complain of hardneſſe of heart, and the fruits thereof; when it hath been ſhewed that this hardneſſe of heart hath been brought upon man for his own ſin, and no exception taken againſt it. But when out of Gods abſoluteneſſe men are hardned, then, and not till then may it juſtly ſeem ſtrange that God ſhould complain of the hardneſſe of mens hearts, and the fruites thereof. As for the place of *Eſa.* 63. 17. Wherein you ſuppoſe Gods people to expoſtulate with God for hardning them, notwithſtanding they ſuppoſe that God hardens them for their ſin, this is to beg the queſtion, and not to prove ought, there being no evidence of any ſuch acknowledgment as you ſuppoſe, namely, that God doth harden them for their ſins. Yet if there were any ſuch acknowledgment, it would not forthwith make for your purpoſe unleſſe they ſhould acknowledge as much of that obduration, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, where hee ſets it in oppoſition to Gods ſhewing mercy. To ſerve your turn, you take liberty to interpret the coherence of theſe parts, *to erre from thy waies, and to bee hardned againſt thy feare*: as if the former were the cauſe of the other, upon no other ground that I know, but that thus it ſhall ſtand in more congruity with your opinion. Whereas, indeed there is a farre greater probability, that hardning againſt the feare of God ſhould bee the cauſe of the errour of our wayes, then that errour of our wayes ſhould bee the cauſe of our hardning againſt the feare of God; eſpecially taking hardning, not confuſedly hand over head, but diſtinctly in oppoſition to Gods ſhewing mercy in mans converſion; I take them only as ſeverall expreſſions of the ſame things conſiſting of an in-

ward corrupt disposition as the roote, and that I conceive to bee the want of the feare of God; and the fruit hereof, which is aberration from the good wayes of the Lord.

And they expostulate with God, for not correcting all this by his grace, as by his Covenant of grace, which hee hath made with them, hee hath ingaged himself hereunto, even to keep them from going astray, like a good Shepherd, and *to put his* Jer. 32. 40. *feare into their hearts, that they shall never depart away from him*; Which kinde of expostulation is nothing answerable to that which the Apostle proposeth to answer, *Rom.* 9. 16. And I may well wonder what you meant to yoke them together: *Non bene inequales veniunt ad aratra juvenci.* The children of God doe not expostulate with God for his complaining of their disobedience, unthankfulnesse, and rebellions against him, though they heartily wish they had never provoked him, and expostulate with him for not preserving them by his grace, from such courses of provocation of him, even of the eyes of his glory. The wicked have no such desire to bee preserved from sin and sinfull courses, which are unto them as sweet bits, which they roule under their tongues; Although when they heare of the Doctrine of obduration and his power to harden them, and in hardning they may take advantage thereby to blaspheme God, and to plead Apologie for themselves; Belike then you acknowledge that God hath power to harden without respect to sin, for to this purpose tends your comparative illustration.

But then you must bee driven to deny that obduration is a punishment; seeing it is impossible that just punishments can have course but with respect to sin, as a meritorious cause thereof. That God beateth down the objectour, and pleadeth the justice of Gods proceedings against Reprobates, from the soveraign authority of God over his creatures is most true, *ver.* 20, 21. But that hee pleads the *due desert of the persons*, *ver.* 22. thereby to justifie God in hardning whom hee will, is positively avouched, but so farre from truth, as that it involves plain contradiction; no lesse then if the Apostle after hee had said that God hath mercy on whom hee will, should afterward take a course to justifie God herein, by saying that God hath mercy on none, but in respect to their former good works.

Nay,

Nay, much more contradictions, for as much as no good works in the ſtate of nature or grace, can bee meritorious of reward. But ſins may bee and are truely meritorious of puniſhment. In the 22 *verſ.* there is not the leaſt mention of obduration, much leſſe any mention of the cauſe thereof, leaſt of all, any reverſing of the former cauſe (expreſſed *ver.* 18. and juſtifyed *ver.* 20. from the authority of God the Creator, having power to make his creatures of what faſhion hee will,) and ſubſtituting a new in the place thereof. And although all that are veſſels of wrath are ſinners, and conſequently deſerve puniſhment, yet obduration, in oppoſition to ſhewing mercy, conſiſting in the deniall of ſaving grace, is no puniſhment, for as much as God doth not thereby withdraw any ſaving grace from them, which formerly they injoyed; and as for inflicting evill, that hath no place in obduration, for as much as all confeſſe that God doth not obdurate any man, *infundendo malitiam*, but *non infundendo gratiam*. Neither is it ſin either originall, or actuall, that which conſtitutes a man a veſſell of wrath, as a veſſell of wrath is oppoſite to a veſſell of mercy. For ſin both originall and actuall is incident to the Elect as well as to the Reprobate: but like as Gods ſhewing mercy makes a man a veſſell of mercy: ſo Gods denyall of mercy, finally conſtitutes a veſſell of wrath, expoſing him to finall infidelity or impenitency, which ſin alone is not found in any of the elect. It ſeems you think they are fitted to deſtruction by themſelves, as if *vaſa* the veſſels did ſeparate, and not *Herus* the Maſter rather. Sin alone makes a man obnoxious to condemnation as deſerving it, and ſo there is ſin in the beſt of Gods children, to drive them to confeſſe, that *if the Lord ſhould bee extream to mark what is done amiſſe, none were able to abide it*: Yet the ſin of the Reprobates you confeſſe God could prevent, and not preventing it, yet could cure it by the blood of Chriſt, ſo that though ſin bee granted to bee a cauſe hereof, yet a more originall cauſe (though nothing culpable) muſt bee acknowledged to bee the deniall of Grace; as our Saviour budgeth not to profeſſe to the faces of ſome; *Yee therefore heare not my words, becauſe yee are not of God*, and Joh. 12. 40. *Therefore they could not believe*, becauſe *Eſaias* ſaith, Hee hath blinded their eyes, and hardned their hearts,

that they should not see with their eyes, and understand with their hearts, and should bee converted, and I should heale them.

Answer. All this while have I maintained, the safenesse of that exposition which interpreteth Gods hatred of *Esau*, of a lesse degree of love, and the same word is also used in the same sense; But yet so understand mee, I conceive this lesse degree of Love, to have somewhat in it of the true nature of Hatred. For as the nature of Love standeth in affecting communion with one, and communicating good unto him: So likewise the nature of hatred stands in the contrary to this, either in affecting separation from one, or inflicting evill on him, or at least in not vouchsafing communion, or communicating good unto him. So is a man said to hate his brother, that will not vouchsafe him such an office of brotherly communion, as that hee will communicate a kindly reproofe to him for his sin.

Now I would easily grant, that before *Esau* had done good or evill, God so hated him, as that hee did not communicate to him that fellowship with Christ, which by Gods election and donation the members of the body have with him their head in Gods account, even before the world was. Neither did God vouchsafe that plentifull communication of his free grace unto him, as might in time by a reall actuall power draw him to Christ and to live by him: Yea God was pleased to set him in a state further remote, and separate from him then his elect brother: Even in the estate of a servant to the elect: and in stead of communicating free grace, hee purposed to deale with him rather according to his works, by a covenant of Justice; For both these are implyed in Gods putting of *Esau* into the state of a servant.

First, the denyall of such grace and fatherly love to him as is reserved for children.

Secondly, the (not) refusing of him to just dealing, such as is due to servants according to their works.

Exam. I look to receive from you some proofe that the word Hatred is used in the same sense, to wit, to signifie a lesse degree of Love, for to my judgement, it is a wilde interpretation; for in this sense God might bee said to hate every one of Gods elect excepting Christ, for hee loves them all in a lesse degree then

then hee loved Chriſt, and one in a leſſe degree then another, according as degrees of Love attributed to God are to bee eſtimated, that is, not *quoad affectum*, (for undoubtedly there are no degrees to bee found in the nature of God) but *quoad effectum*, and undoubtedly God alots one degree of grace to one, and another degree to another, and as hee deales with them in communicating of grace, ſo in the communicating of Glory alſo. Love and hatred, undoubtedly are oppoſite contrarily, and not onely contradictorily. And becauſe *quot modis dicitur unum oppoſitorum, tot modis dicitur & alterum*; as love of complacency conſiſts in delectation, ſo hatred oppoſite is of diſplicency or averſation. And as love of beneficence conſiſteth in wiſhing or doing good: So hatred oppoſite conſiſts in wiſhing or doing evill to another.

Here at length I obſerve the place you ſtand upon to prove that hatred in holy Scripture, doth ſometimes ſignifie a leſſe degree of love, and that ſeemes to bee *Levit.* 19. 17. *Thou ſhalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, thou ſhalt plainely rebuke thy brother, and ſuffer him not to ſin.* And to ſerve your turn in this interpretation, you ſhape a correſpondent practiſe of Love conſiſting in vouchſafing communion; which unleſſe it bee a communion of reproofe, is nothing to your purpoſe, who deſire to ſhape hatred in contradiction thereunto. And yet hatred, all conceive to bee much more then not to love. But were all this yeelded unto you, yet doth it fall ſhort of your purpoſe; for albeit hee that forbears to reprove his brother, doth him harm, yet if hee doe not intend him harm, hee cannot bee ſaid to hate him. For in Scripture phraſe hatred denotes an intention to harm, as *Deut.* 4. 42. Where wee reade that certain Cities were appointed, *That the ſlayer might fly unto, which had killed his Neighbour at unawares, and hated him not in times paſt.* But if you meaſure hatred by the harm done, why ſhould the ſparing of reproofe to preſerve a brother from ſin, and conſequently from incurring the wrath of God, bee ſo qualifyed as to bee accounted a leſſe degree of love, and not a fruite of hatred: for conſider I beſeech you, is not this farre worſe then to miſchiefe a man by cutting off an arm or limb? So that albeit Scripture did plainely profeſſe that not to reprove a neighbour, but ſuffer him to ſin, were an act of ha-

tred, yet it followeth not hence, that hatred in this caſe ſignifies onely a leſſe degree of love. For certainly, ſuch an act (to wit, in ſparing reproofe) is worſe by far then to give a man a box on the eare; yet I preſume you will not interpret that to bee hatred onely in ſuch a ſenſe, as ſignifying a leſſe degree of Love. For certainly the fruites of love are the communications of good, and not any contumelious inflicting of evill. But by your leave I doe not finde that this is the Scriptures meaning in the place you aime at; but rather in my judgement it ſeems to meet with a corrupt courſe of the world, prone to conceive none to bee their greater enemies, then ſuch as reprove them. To prevent this, the Lord forbids the one, to wit, the hating of our brother, and as expreſſely commands the other, to wit, to reprove our Neighbour, manifeſting thereby that reproofe may bee performed, without any juſt ſuſpition of hatred in him that reproveth. In fine, this interpretation of hatred which here you make, is imbraced by *Voſſius* in his *Pelagian* Story; but hee doth not betray that hee is beholding to *Cornelius de Lapide* the Jeſuite for it, in his Commentaries on the ninth to the *Romans*. And hee brings other manner of inſtances to prove it then you doe. And ſo doth *Junius* alſo in *Gen.* 29. 31. though hee were farre enough off from applying it in the ſame ſenſe to *Eſau*, as his ſon in law *Voſſius* doth, and the Jeſuite doth before *Voſſius*.

In few words your meaning is, God did ſo far hate *Eſau*, even before hee had done good or evill, that hee did not deſtinate unto him any ſaving grace as hee did unto *Jacob*. May you not as well ſay that hee did not deſtinate unto him glory, as hee did to *Jacob*? And even this in *Aquinas* his language is to hate, where hee interpreteth Gods hatred of *Eſau* before hee was born. Yet you might bee pleaſed to goe a little further, and to affirm that God did not onely not deſtinate unto him any ſaving grace, but alſo that God was purpoſed to deny him ſuch ſaving grace as hee granted unto *Jacob*, and conſequently hee purpoſed to deny him glory alſo; if you bee pleaſed to gratifie your ſelf in yeelding to this truth, wee will willingly gratifie you in acknowledging that notwithſtanding all this, God purpoſed to deale with *Eſau* according to his works.

As for that phrase of yours of putting him into the estate of a servant; though it bee of little materiall consideration in this place, yet I have sufficiently discussed it, in examining your Answer to the first Doubt.

The Fifth Doubt.

Question, 5.

HOw may it appeare that all have a sufficiency of comming to Christ, since no man can come without drawing? *Joh.* 6. 44. 65. and hee who is drawn shall bee raised to life; or since no man can come except it bee given him of the Father. Which speech is a reason why wee ought not to murmure or bee offended if some beleeve not; *Rom.* 11. 7. and since none but the Elect by the meanes of helpe and power, *Revelat.* 2. 15.

Answ. I no where say, nor ever thought that all men had a sufficiency of power to beleeve or to come to Christ. Far bee it from mee to avouch such ungracious Pelagianisme; But this I say, God giveth to the men of this world, this world, I say, as opposed to the elect, such meanes and helps of seeking after the Lord, and finding mercy from him, that they are sufficiently enabled by him to doe much more then they doe, that way, they are deprived of those drawing and effectuall means without which none can come, and with which none ever failed to come to Faith and Repentance: Else how shall wee understand these and sundry such like places of Scripture, *Act.* 17. 25, 26, 27. *Rom.* 1. 19. to 25. *Rom.* 2. 4, 5. 14, 15. *Luk.* 16. 31, 32. *Act.* 1. 51, 52. *Act.* 13. 46. *Matth.* 22. 37, 38. *Luk.* 19. 41, 42. *Ezek.* 24. 13. *Prov.* 1. 20. to 30. 2 *Chron.* 36. 15, 16. *Hose.* 11. 4. *Esa.* 5. 3, 4, 5. *Job* 33. 14. to 18. *Joh.* 16. 69? From all which places I gather foure Conclusions, pertinent to the point in hand.

Firstly, That God offereth to the men of this world, helps and means, either of the knowledge of God in Nature, or of grace in Christ: and that to this end, to lead them to Repentance and Salvation. Thus is God said to manifest to the Gentiles,

tiles, that which may bee known of him by his works, and by his Law writen in their hearts, and that to this end, to make them to seek after the Lord; to leade them to Repentance, to withdraw them from their courses, to heale their pride and to save their soules from the pit. Thus God offered to the carnall Israelites means of grace to purge them, to turn them, *Prov.* 1. 13. to gather them, *Mat.* 23. 37. to convince them, *Joh.* 16. 8, 9. To draw them with cords of man and bands of love, *Hos.* 11. 4. To dresse them to bring forth good fruit, *Esa.* 5. 4.

Secondly, That the meanes God useth for these good ends, are in some measure sufficient (if they bee not hindered by men) to bring them to the attainment of these ends: for when God saith himself, hee useth these meanes for these ends; for us to say, these meanes are not sufficient for these ends, seemeth to mee to derogate from the wisdom and sufficiency of God, whose works are all of them perfect, *Deut.* 32. 4. and so sufficient for the ends for which hee wrought them. Yet God forbid I should doubt of that which our Saviour telleth the Jews, No man can come to Christ, except the Father draw him, *Joh.* 6. 44. by the same Almighty power and authority, whereby hee sent Christ into the world.

Exam. The whole tenour of your Answer in clearing the Fifth Doubt looks this way, as if you maintained a sufficiency of power in those whom wee account Reprobates to perform such things, upon the performance whereof they should bee saved. I confesse you doe not make any expresse mention of Faith, but of obedience in generall, and of repentance; which I presume you will acknowledge, will bee inseparable from Faith. And that you doe acknowledge a sufficiency in them to perform Obedience and Repentance requisite to Salvation, I prove thus:

You maintain a true desire in God, of their Salvation; and how can this stand with the denyall of such sufficiency as is in his power to grant?

Againe, You expressely maintain, that there is in God, a serious and fervent affection, not concerning their Salvation only, but their Conversion also. Which how it can stand with a denyall of sufficient power to turn unto God, I comprehend not.

Third-

Thirdly, You plainly affirm, that mankinde *slights to work out with the Trinity, their ſalvation.* Now no man can bee ſaid to ſlight the doing thereof, for the doing whereof hee hath no power. You maintain there is in a reprobate mans power to work out his ſalvation with the Trinity.

Fourthly, the compariſon you make to repreſent Gods different dealing with his Elect, and with the reprobate, doth intimate as much. The ſervant you ſay is only perſwaded to yeeld himſelf to bee cut, that hee may bee cured of the ſtone, yet earneſtly and forcibly perſwaded: The ſon over and above is taken by the Father and bound and cut, that hee may bee cured. Now as it is in the power of the ſervant to yeeld to bee cut, that hee may bee cured, ſo do you hereby intimate that it is in the power of a Reprobate to yeeld to bee converted, that God may heale him.

Fifthly, you doe acknowledge that Gods purpoſe to give life unto the world upon condition of obedience, doth imply that God ſhould accordingly give means to help them to the performance of this obedience; for you plainly ſignifie that God purpoſing to give life unto the world upon condition of obedience, doth accordingly give meanes to help them to the performance of this obedience. Now I ſay, Gods purpoſe to give life unto the world, upon condition of obedience, doth no more imply that God muſt accordingly give means to help them to the performance of this obedience, then that God muſt accordingly give ability by the help of ſuch means to perform obedience. And indeed, to what end tends the giving of means to help them to the performance of obedience, if they have not ability by the help of thoſe means to perform obedience? In this very Section you profeſſe the meanes which God affords are ſufficient to bring them to thoſe gracious ends, which God (you ſay) intends, if they bee not hindred by men. Which doth imply that in your opinion, the men of the world have power to give way unto them, and not hinder them. Yet I confeſſe you are very ſparing to confeſſe ſo much. But the more you are to blame by the face of your diſcourſe to beſpeak ſuch opinions in your Readers, and to draw unto them, the maintenance whereof you dare not undertake your ſelf. But let us conſider what you deliver hereupon. And

First, though you doe not attribute unto a naturall man ſufficiency, and power to beleeve: yet if you doe attribute unto him ſufficiency of power to perform ought, upon performance whereof grace ſhall bee given him, whereby hee ſhall bee enabled to beleeve and to come to Chriſt, you ſhall even in this bee guilty of that, which you call ungracious Pelagianiſme. Now as for your opinion of the power of a naturall man, you here expreſſe it partly negatively, partly affirmatively. You confeſſe, they are deprived of thoſe drawing and effectuall meanes, without which none can come, and with which, none ever failed to come to Faith and Repentance. Touching which I have ſomething to oppoſe concerning the phraſe, and ſomething concerning the aſſertion it ſelf.

The word *meanes* uſed by you, and which you call effectuall, wee commonly underſtand as things outward; ſuch as either the Word of God, and the Miniſtry thereof, or the Works of God and the manifeſtation of his providence therein. But you ſeem to goe further, and comprehend thereby the effectuall operation of Gods Spirit, which is very ambiguous, and being delivered in the generall, is the fitter to ſerve a mans turn, ſometimes in the one, ſometimes in the other ſignification. As touching the aſſertion it ſelf, it utterly overthrowes all that you have delivered in clearing the fifth Doubt. For with what ſobriety can God bee ſaid to entertain an earneſt and ſerious affection, concerning their converſion, (which is as much as to ſay concerning their repentance) being reſolved to deprive them of thoſe drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to repentance?

Again, how can God bee ſaid to entertain an earneſt and ſerious affection concerning their Salvation, being reſolved to deprive them of thoſe drawing and effectuall meanes, without which none can come to Repentance, and conſequently without which none can bee ſaved? As for the affirmative part, you ſay the Reprobates are ſufficiently enabled by God, to do much more then they doe, in ſeeking after the Lord, and finding mercy from him, and that by certain means and helpes. Now in this place I conceive by means and helps you underſtand only outward things, as either the adminiſtration of Gods providence in his Works, or the miniſtry of his Word, and not the

the effectuall operation of Gods Spirit, bestowing any power upon them, which naturally they had not, though this must needs bee your meaning in the negative part of the assertion. But as touching the assertion it self, there is no question but every naturall man, hath power to doe more then hee doth, in the way of actions naturall, but in the way of doing ought that is good, and pleasing in the sight of God, I know no power incident to a naturall man: for as much as the Apostle saith, *They that are in the flesh cannot please God.* Yet I confesse according as the world accounts morality, every naturall man hath power to doe more good then hee doth, and to abstain more from evill then hee doth, that is, hee may give more Almes then hee doth, hee may bee more temperate then hee is: but whether hee doth that, which for the substance of the action is accounted good; or abstaines from some particular evill actions; yet neither the one nor the other is or can bee performed by him in a gracious, but rather in an ungracious manner; and whether this bee accounted, a seeking after the Lord, and that to finde mercy from him, I dare appeale to your own judgement; yet this is not all you maintain. For whereas the Lord may bee sought after, as the God and governour of nature onely; you further say in the next page, that there is a sufficiency of power in the means, to lead the men of this world, to come to the knowledge of God, and to grace in Christ.

But let us examine the places of Scripture, which you muster up in great abundance. The first is out of *Act.* 17. 25, 26, 27. There wee read that *God is not worshipped with mens hands, as though hee needed any thing, seeing hee giveth to all, life and breath and all things.* 26. *And hath made of one blood all mankinde, to dwell upon all the face of the earth, and hath assigned the seasons which were ordained before, and the bounds of their habitation.* 27. ζητεῖν τὸν κύριον, *That they should seek the Lord, if so bee they might have groped after him and found him, though doubtlesse hee bee not farre from every one of us.* 28. *For in him wee live and move, &c.* This seemes to bee the most principall place whereon you insist, not only by setting it in the first place, but in as much as you deliver your opinion, in the phrase of seeking the Lord, here alone expressed. But this doth nothing serve your turn.

For firſt, here is no mention at all of any ſufficiency and power, that naturall men either by this providence of God, or otherwiſe have attained unto for ſeeking of the Lord. For conſider I pray; the manifeſtation of Gods grace in his word, is farre more able to inable us to ſeek the Lord, then the manifeſtation of his providence in his works; yet by the manifeſtation of his grace in his word, it followeth not that as many as are partakers thereof, are indued with power of ſeeking the Lord in ſuch ſort as to finde mercy from him. I confeſſe that *to ſeek the Lord* is a phraſe of a very generall ſignification, not denoting any materiall action, but containing onely a certain denomination, which may paſſe upon many materiall actions; and this Diſcourſe of yours is throughout carryed in ſuch generalities, which are very apt to deceive. For *in genere latent multæ æquivocationes.* And for a man to reſt on ſuch, is to bee in love with his own errours. But I am confident it is onely your zeale of juſtifying God in his waies againſt the imputation caſt upon him by fleſh and blood, that makes you take hold of, and content your ſelf with ſuch generall notions, I ſhould think that ζητεῖν τὸ κύριον *to ſeek the Lord*, in this place, in reference to Gods workes, is of the ſame ſignification in the generall with ζητεῖν τὸν κύριον, to ſeek the Lord, in reference to his word; that is the thing, not whereunto we are hereby enabled, but the thing whereof wee are thereby admoniſhed. As Verſe 30. it is ſaid, *Now hee admoniſheth every man, every where to repent*; to wit, by the preaching of his Word: Hee doth not ſay, *Hee doth enable every man, every where to repent.* So; *The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the Firmament ſheweth his handy-worke*: And *that which may bee knowne of God, is made manifeſt by his workes.* Rom. 1. *And hee leaves not himſelfe without witneſſe, giving rain and fruitfull ſeaſons, filling our hearts with food and gladneſſe.* And ſo here, Hee hath aſſigned the ſeaſons which hee ordained before, and the bounds of their habitations ζητεῖν τὸν κύριον, to ſeek the Lord, that is, as I conceive, to admoniſh them to ſeek the Lord: foraſmuch, as though the inviſible things of God, are ſaid to be manifeſted by his workes: yet it is in ſuch a manner, as it requires ſtudy and deep contemplation, to attaine to theſe inviſible things of God, in the moſt indifferent meaſure:

Pſal. 19. 1.
Rom. 1. 20.
Act. 14. 17.

But

But say, wee have power, and all men have power to seek the Lord, that is, to search out those invisible things of God, which are made manifest by his Works, as many Naturalists have done; and to give instance: As *Aristotle* hath searched after an *Ens primum*, a first being; and hath found out immateriall substances, and amongst them a first mover, in the contemplation of whom the felicity of all the rest consists; and hath delivered strange conclusions concerning his Nature: Yet I deny that any man hath power naturall, so to seek after the Lord, as to finde mercy from him. To this purpose it is not enough to know him as the Authour of Nature, but wee must take forth, and know him as a Redeemer, and authour of Grace. For I presume you wil not say that *Aristotle* after his most studious inquisitions after the Lord, did finde mercy from him.

Nay, this great searcher into the secrets of Nature, denyed his Omnipotency, for they could not bee drawn to beleeve that hee was able to produce any thing out of nothing, this was the generall opinion of them all in a manner. Thence hee proceeded to deny that the world had a beginning: and to maintain that God wrought all that hee wrought by necessity of nature, and not by freedom of will. Yet this eternall power and Godhead they did acknowledge, and that hee was to bee worshipped for the dignity of his nature. But not either out of feare of punishment, or hope of reward. Such notions were rather popular then Scholasticall, a manifest evidence that the world was brought to conceive more soberly of the nature of God, by instinct of Nature, then by discourse of reason. For such as followed discourse of reason most, became most Atheisticall as touching the providence of God; yet all agreed in this, that hee was incorruptible, which was sufficient to convict them of impiety, in changing the glory of the uncorruptible God unto the similitude of the Image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of foure-footed beasts, and creeping things. And did not they profit best in the Schoole of Nature, who by the observation of providence in the way of mercies and judgments, were driven to acknowledge an unknown God, and to erect Altars for his worship? And as for seeking of the Lord, so as to finde him in any comfortable manner, doth not the Apostle as good as confesse despaire of such

power in naturall men, when forthwith hee addeth, *If so bee*
Act 17.26,27. *they might have groaped after him, and found him, though doubtlesse hee bee not farre from every one of us, for in him wee live, move, and have our being.* And yet as for the Apostles finding of him in this place, I should rather thinke that it is in reference to the apprehension of his nature (as the Creator of all) rather then of his goodnesse (as a Redeemer) so to finde mercy from him though you seem to aime at this interpretation.

Your second place is out of *Rom.* 1. 19. to 25. *That which may bee known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them.* Where? *In his works*, as it followeth. *For the invisible things of him, that is, his eternall power and God-head, are seen* (not *by*, but) *from the creation of the world, being considered in his works.* If the Apostle had here added εἰς τὸ ζητεῖν τὸν κύριον, *to seek the Lord*, and to finde mercy from him, it had beene more faire for your purpose. But the Apostle addes εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους *to the intent that they should bee without excuse, viz.* in a particular case, to wit, *because they did not glorifie God as God, but turned the glory of the incorruptible God into the similitude of the Image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things.* Neither do wee deny but men have power to discern the nature of God, to bee incorruptible, and consequently they are inexcusable in the way of Idolatry. But whereas Idolatry is but the third kinde of blasphemy, in attributing to the creature, that which belongs to God himself. And there are two sorts of blasphemy besides this: One in attributing to God that which doth not become him. Another in denying unto God that which doth become him; will you say that every naturall man hath power to discern the nature of God in such sort as to preserve himself from blasphemy every way?

The third place is out of *Rom.* 2. 4,5. *Despisest thou the riches of his bountifulnesse, and patience, and long sufferance, not knowing that the bountifulnesse of God leadeth thee to repentance?* 5. *But thou after thine hardnesse, and heart that cannot repent, heapest up unto thy self, a treasure, wrath against the day of wrath.* Now if this doth imply any ability in man of seeking the Lord, and finding mercy from him, it must needs bee in the way of repentance. And this I confesse is a cleare way, both of seeking

the Lord, and of finding mercy from him. But dare you ſay that a naturall man hath power to repent? I preſume you will not, unleſſe you frame repentance after ſuch a notion, as will bee found to bee neither ſeeking of the Lord, nor finding mercy from him. And you your ſelf here profeſſe, that *God deprives them of thoſe drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to repentance.* And in the very place alledged, it is expreſſely ſaid of them whom God is ſaid *to lead to repentance*, that *the hardneſſe of their heart* is ſuch, *that they cannot repent.*

The fourth is taken out of *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. *When the Gentiles which have not the Law, doe by nature the things contained in the Law, they having not the Law, are a law unto themſelves, which ſhew the effect of the Law written in their heart, their conſcience alſo bearing witneſſe, and their thoughts accuſing one another, or excuſing.* I wiſh things were carryed with leſſe oſtentation, and with more judgement, then to alledge Scriptures, and put the Reader upon making Arguments for them thence. For my part I ſee no colour in all this, to juſtifie any power and ſufficiency in a Reprobate to ſeek the Lord, and to finde mercy from him: though I make no queſtion, but they have power to abſtain from many things prohibited in the Law of God, and to doe things commanded, as touching the ſubſtance of the duty commanded, or the action forbidden: though they are farre enough off from doing it for Gods ſake, and out of the love of God, with all their heart, and with all their ſoule, as whom they knew not even the very beſt of them, 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 5.

The fifth is drawn out of *Luk.* 16. 11, 12. *If yee have not been faithfull in the wicked riches, who will truſt you in the true treaſures? And if you have not been faithfull in another mans goods, who ſhall give you that which is your own?* Hence you ſeem to infer, that carnall men, naturall men, have power and ability to perform faithfulneſſe in the adminiſtration of temporall riches: and you might proceed further to inferre, that by performing ſuch fidelity, which is in their power to perform, they ſhould have true riches, and ſuch as ſhould never bee taken from them. And what is to maintain that God doth diſpence grace according to works, if this bee not? And yet this

latter

latter is with more probability inferred then the former. For certainly God doth reward faithfulneſſe in little, with the beſtowing of greater gifts, as *Matth.* 25.21.23. But albeit they that are unfaithfull in little, are unworthy to have greater gifts beſtowed upon them; yet herehence it doth not follow, that meer naturall men have ſo much power of goodneſſe in them, as to bee faithfull unto God in the uſe of thoſe naturall gifts which God hath beſtowed upon them, (yet in ſpight of this unworthineſſe, which God findes in his Elect, before their calling, hee doth nevertheleſſe truſt them with true riches. And if they were faithfull therein, they would bee found faithfull alſo in greater things. For *ver.* 10. our Saviour profeſſeth, *That hee who is faithfull in the leaſt, is alſo faithfull in much.*

The ſixth place is, *Act.* 7. 51,52. *Yee ſtiffe-necked, and of uncircumciſed hearts and eares, yee have alwayes reſiſted the Holy Ghoſt.* 52. *Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers perſecuted?* That which you ſtick upon (I doubt not) is this, that they are ſaid alway to have reſiſted the Holy Ghoſt, both they and their Fathers. Wee deny it not: but will you herehence inſer that they had power and ability to yeeld to the Holy Ghoſt? If this inference like you, then you may bee bold to inſerre in like manner, That becauſe many reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt moving them to faith and repentance; therefore they have power and ability to yeeld to the Holy Ghoſt in this alſo, that is, to beleeve and repent. Yet your ſelf profeſſe in this very Section, that *God deprives them of thoſe drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come*, to wit, to the Lord, and finde mercy from him; which yet undoubtedly they ſhould do, did they beleeve and repent. Yet I deny not, but they might have abſtained from perſecuting the Prophets; but I deny that it was in the power of any of them (being but naturall men) to abſtaine from it in a gratious manner, and acceptable in the ſight of God. And ſo long as they did not abſtain ſo, is it fit to call it a ſeeking after the Lord, or finding of mercy from him? I preſume you will not deny but that many a Jew in the Apoſtles daies were free from faction, contenting himſelf to enjoy his own courſe quietly and peaceably, was yet further off from grace then *Paul* that perſecuted the Church; God calling him in the midſt of his furious purſuite, and not calling

ling others though farre more peaceably disposed toward the Church of God then *Saul*.

The seventh place alledged is *Act.* 13.46. *Then* Paul *and* Barnabas *spake boldly, and said, It was necessary that the Word should first have been spoken unto you, but seeing you put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life, wee turn unto the Gentiles.* Hence you inferre that these Jewes were inabled to doe more then they did in seeking the Lord, and finding mercy from him. But I would gladly know wherein that seeking of the Lord consists? Had they not railed against *Paul*, (as I confesse they had power to spare that) had they not contraryed him, nor spoken against those things which were spoken by him, as I confesse they might have held their tongue; had this been to seek the Lord more then they did? or in better manner then they did? I think not: for they might have contained themselves from all this, nay, they might have pretended some propensions to imbrace the Gospel, which yet had it been performed in hypocrisie, it had nothing commended them in the sight of God. As *Diasius*, when hee could not prevaile with his brother to draw him back to Popery, pretended some propension in himself to hearken unto him; but wee know what the issue was, even to slit his head, as the issue of *Judas* his following Christ was to betray him. I think they that deale so, and through zeale persecute the Church, as *Saul* did, are nothing further off from seeking the Lord and finding mercy from him then the other. These did manifest themselves unworthy of eternall life; doe not all so, who stumble at the Word of God, and refuse to hearken to it? For *this is the condemnation of the world, Light is come into the world, and men loved darknesse rather then light, because their deeds were evill*, Joh. 3.16. Will you therehence inferre, that *all such are inabled to obey it*, which is as much to say, as that they are inabled to beleeve and repent?

The eighth is out of *Mat.* 23.37,38. *How often would I have gathered thy children together, as the hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not? Behold your habitation is left unto you desolate, &c.* What I pray you, is to bee gathered under his wings? can it bee lesse then to come unto him? nay, is it not to bee healed by him? since as your selfe observe, healing

was under his wings: and if ſo, to come to Chriſt, is to bee healed by him: can it bee any thing leſſe, then to beleeve and repent? And will you herehence inferre that they had power thus to come under his wings, and conſequently to beleeve and repent?

And yet in this very place you profeſſe that as touching all others except the Elect, *God deprives them of thoſe drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to Faith and Repentance.* Nay, whatſoever it bee, that lies in their power to perform beſides, by the performing of it, doe they come any whit neerer to the participation of Grace? I do not finde you adventure to profeſſe ſo much, for feare of falling into that which you call ungracious Pelagianiſme.

The ninth is *Luk.* 19. 41, 42. Which is of the ſame nature, and of no greater force then the former, *Oh that thou hadſt even knowne at the leaſt in this thy day thoſe things which belong unto thy peace; but now are they hid from thine eyes. For the daies ſhall come upon thee when thy enemies ſhall caſt a trench about thee, and make thee even with the ground, becauſe thou knoweſt not the ſeaſon of thy viſitation.* To know, in Scripture phraſe is of a complicate notion and ſignifyeth knowledge joyned with congruous affections: and thus to know the things that belong unto our peace, is ſo to know, as therewithall to imbrace them; and to know the time of our viſitation, is ſo to know, as to accommodate our ſelves thereto in agreeable converſation, as *Jer.* 8. 7. *The Stork in the aire is ſaid to know her appointed times, and the Turtle, and the Crane, and the Swallow* (are ſaid) *to obſerve the time of their comming.* That is, ſo to know it, as accordingly to come: ſo to know the time of our viſitation, is ſo to know it, as accordingly to come unto God when hee viſites us, and according as his Viſitation requites of us. Now will you herehence inferre, that they were inabled to perform all this, and ſo to ſeek the Lord? I appeale to your own conſcience, whether it might not bee as juſtly ſaid of them, as *Moſes* ſaid of the children of *Iſrael* in the wilderneſſe, *Deut.* 29. 4. *The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to ſee, and eares to heare, unto this day.* Nay, doth not our Saviour himſelf ſay as much of theſe Jews, *Joh.* 12. 39. *Therefore they could not beleeve, becauſe that* Eſaias *ſaith again.* 40. *Hee hath blinded their*

eies,

eyes and hardned their hearts, that they ſhould not ſee with their eyes, and underſtand with their hearts, and ſhould bee converted, and I ſhould heale them. Neither will it follow hereupon that they are excuſable ſo much the more, although this is a very plauſible inference, for our Saviour profeſſeth (notwithſtanding this) that *they had no cloak for their ſins*, John 15. 22. And indeed onely ſuch an inability doth excuſe, as whereby a man is unable to doe that which hee fain would doe. As for the doing of that they did in reſiſting the Goſpel, they had rather too much will therein then too little, and that through the want of grace.

For as *Auſtin* wiſely obſerves: *Libertas ſine gratia non eſt libertas, ſed contumacia.* Liberty without grace, is not liberty, but wilfulneſſe.

The tenth is, *Ezek.* 24. 13. *Becauſe I would have purged thee, and thou waſt not purged, thou ſhalt not bee purged from thy filthineſſe, till I have cauſed my wrath to light upon thee.* I ſhould think this were ſpoken of Gods Elect, not ſo much by obſerving that phraſe, *till I have cauſed my wrath to light upon thee*, but chiefly by comparing it with Ezek. 22. 10. *I will ſcatter thee among the heathen, and diſperſe thee in the Countries, and will cauſe thy filthineſſe to depart from thee.* It may have place, not onely of the Elect, but of the regenerate alſo, for even them ſometimes *God doth cauſe to erre from his wayes, and harden their hearts againſt his feare.* Which though they have power to repent, yet upon ſuppoſition of obduration, and ſo long as that continues, it may bee ſaid that they cannot repent. How much more may it bee verifyed of naturall men, in the ſtate of unregeneracy, that they cannot repent? And ſhall this any way hinder the courſe of Gods judgements againſt them for their ſins unrepented of, becauſe without grace it is not in their power to purge themſelves from their ſins by repentance? I deny not but they have power to performe feigned repentance, as *Jer.* 3. 10. And ſhall feigned repentance (think you) bee of force to keep off the judgments of God? or if Gods judgements ſhall have their courſe, except they bee prevented by unfeigned repentance, will it herehence follow that naturall men are inabled to perform unfeigned repentance? Eſa. 63. 17.

The eleventh is *Prov.* 1. 20. to 30. *Wiſdome cryeth, &c.* 20 *How*

long will yee love foolishnesse? ver. 22. *Turn you at my correction,* ver. 23. *Because I have called and yee have refused, &c.* ver. 24. *I will also laugh at your destruction,* ver. 28. Will you herehence infer that they were enabled to turn, to hearken to wisdoms voyce, and think to put a difference betwixt your opinion, and that of the *Pelagians* of old, by saying that though naturall men have not power to beleeve and repent, yet they are inabled to doe more good then they doe, in the way of seeking the Lord and finding mercy from him? and pin upon every place you alledge, such a distinction as this, which you no where manifest sufficiently to understand your selfe, as touching the latter part of it; So loath you are to shew what are the particulars of seeking the Lord, they doe attain to, and to what particulars further they might attain, and of what particulars they must necessarily fall short, for want of certain helps.

Might you not as well infer, that it is in the power of man to make him a new heart, because God cals upon him to make him a new heart? *Austin* was wont to say and advise rather in this manner. *In præcepto cognosce quid debeas habere, in correptione cognosce tuo te vitio non habere, in oratione cognosce unde possis habere.* In Gods precept know what you ought to have, in his rebuke take notice that through your fault you have it not, in prayer know whence you may have it.

The twelfth is out of 2 *Chron.* 36. 15, 16. *And the Lord God of their fathers sent unto them by his Messengers, rising early and sending, for hee had compassion on his people, and on his habitation.* 16. *But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his Prophets, untill the wrath of God rose against his people, and till there was no remedy.* I doe not deny but that it was in their power not to misuse the Prophets, nor to mock his Messengers, but doe you not think, that amongst these naughty figges, some were nothing so bad, and yet did not the wrath of God come upon them as well as upon others.

Again, consider, what of all this, yet if they had repented, had not their fouleſt sins hereupon been done away? so that for want of repentance, the wrath of God brake forth against them. Now why doe you not as well infer herehence, that they had

had power to repent, and so to seek after the Lord, and find mercy from him?

Thirdly, was it not enough to bring the wrath of God upon them, to bee found guilty of despising his words, and hath any naturall man power to keep himself from this sin? Is there any greater despising of them, then to esteem so basely of them, as to account them no better then foolishnesse? Now is any naturall man free from this? Doth not the Holy Ghost tell us, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *The naturall man perceives not the things of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him?* But by the way I observe, wee little agree in the notion of free will; which (if I bee not deceived) was never accounted by the Learned, to consist in ought other then in election of means. As for the end, according to the habituall disposition of the heart and will, a man is necessarily carryed to the affection of an agreeable end, agreeable, I say, to his own disposition. Whence it followeth, that albeit it bee in the power of grace alone, to change the heart and renew the will, yet whatsoever the unregenerate either doe or refuse to doe, they carry themselves herein freely, in as much as they proceed herein with choyce in respect of their own ends.

I come to the thirteenth out of *Hos.* 11. 4. *I led them with cords of a man, and with bands of love, and I was to them as hee that taketh away the yoke from their jawes, and I laid their meate unto them.* Was not such like the Lords dealing with the children of *Israel*, when hee took them by the hand to bring them out of the Land of *Egypt*? Did hee not leade them with the cords of Love? did hee not take off the yoke from their jaws? did hee not lay Manna before them? yet of them doth *Moses* professe, that notwithstanding all this, *God gave them not an heart to perceive, nor eyes to see, nor eares to heare unto that day.* And in this Text alledged, what colour is there to justify this your distinction; namely, that albeit *God deprives Reprobates of those drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to faith and repentance, yet they are inabled by him to doe much more then they doe, in seeking after the Lord, and finding mercy from him.* Deut. 29. 4.

The fourteenth is out of *Esa.* 5. 3,4,5. *Judge I pray you betweene mee and my vineyard.* 4. *What could I have done more to*

my Vineyard, that I have not done unto it? why have I looked that it ſhould bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wilde grapes? 5. *And now I will tell you what I will doe to my vineyard.* I conceive herein you may deviſe a treble ground to build upon. I could wiſh your ſelf had dealt plainely, and argued herehence, the juſtification of your premiſed diſtinction. It might have ſaved your Reader a great deale of paines, whereas now by the manner of your Diſcourſe, hee is driven as well to argue for you, as to anſwer for himſelf, that hee may keep himſelf from being overtaken with errour upon a generall conſideration ere hee is aware.

The firſt ground may bee, that *God ſeems to profeſſe, that hee had done what hee could doe*; now undoubtedly hee could give them power to doe more good then they did, in the way of ſeeking the Lord, which is the thing that you affirm, and therefore hee did give this power: but ſay I, God could give means alſo to draw effectually unto repentance; and conſequently hee did draw them hereunto, which is the thing that your ſelf deny, and the Text it ſelf alſo, for inſtead of ſweet grapes, they brought forth wilde grapes.

Secondly, you may ground upon this, that God expected they ſhould bring forth ſweet grapes, and upon ſuch grounds you uſually make Collections, and herehence you may infer, that therefore they had power to bring forth ſweet grapes. But this conſequent is untrue by your opinion; for ſweet grapes muſt needs bee gratefull unto God, and no leſſe then Faith and Repentance. But you confeſſe that *God deprives them of ſuch drawing and effectuall means without which none can come, and with which none ever failed to come to faith and repentance.*

The third ground may bee Gods reſolution to lay his vineyard waſte. And thence you may infer that they had power to avoid ſuch ſins as were the cauſes thereof. But conſider, I pray you, is it not juſt with God to damne the world for infidelity and impenitency, and will you herehence infer that it was in their power to beleeve and repent? I preſume you will not.

The fifteenth is *Job* 33. 14. to the 18. there wee read that *God ſpeaketh once and twice, and one ſeeth it not, even in dreames and viſions of the night.* 15. When this will not ſerve the turn, *hee opens*

the

the eares of man, even *by the corrections which hee hath ſealed*, ver. 16. and that which God aimes at in this is, *That hee might cauſe man to turn away from his enterpriſe, and that hee might hide the pride of man*, ver. 17. *and keepe back his ſoule from the pit, and that his life ſhould not paſſe by the Sword*, ver. 18. All this repreſents the power of Gods grace in overcomming the hardneſſe of mans heart, together with the wiſdome of God, proceeding various wayes to the ſame end, an inſtance whereof wee have in *Manaſſes*. But as for any power in man to doe any more good then hee doth in ſeeking after the Lord, here is not the leaſt indication, much leſſe to juſtifie the diſtinction here deviſed by you.

I come to the laſt, taken out of *Joh.* 16. 8, 9. *And when hee is come hee will reprove the world of ſin, becauſe they beleeved not in mee.* It ſeems you inſiſt onely upon the latter, in as much as the allegation reacheth no further. The other parts being explicated in the Verſes following. Cannot Chriſt reprove the world of infidelity, for not beleeving in him, unleſſe thereby bee acknowledged a power in a carnall man to doe more good then hee doth, in the way of ſeeking the Lord? Surely, if any power in man hereto is to bee acknowledged, it muſt bee a power to beleeve in Chriſt; ſeeing infidelity is the ſin whereof the world ſhall bee reproved by Chriſt; and not the ſin of not doing the good they could in the way of ſeeking the Lord.

But your ſelf acknowledge in this ſection that God deprives them of thoſe drawing and effectuall means without which none can come to Faith and Repentance. Much leſſe doth it prove your preſent diſtinction, namely, that albeit God deprives them of ſuch means, without which none can come to Faith and Repentance, yet they are inabled to doe more good then they doe, in the way of ſeeking the Lord.

Means of the knowledge of God, wee confeſſe to bee partly the adminiſtration of his providence in his works, which is the book of his creatures; and there was a time when God did teach the world διὰ πραγμάτων, *by his Works*, as *Chryſoſtome* obſerveth, and not διὰ γραμμάτων, *by his Writings*, and partly by the revelation of his word in the Scriptures. And one of theſe meanes ever was and is afforded unto all. But whereas

you

you ſay God affords them to this end to lead them to ſalvation and repentance. Here is firſt an incongruity, which you are content to ſwallow, to hold up your opinion. For in truth the adminiſtration of Gods Providence in his works, and the revelation of himſelf in his word, is the very leading of them to that whereunto hee leads them, to wit, by admonition. And as it is abſurd to ſay that God doth admoniſh men to the end hee may admoniſh them: ſo is it no leſſe abſurd to ſay, that hee doth lead them, to the end hee may lead them. As for the things whereof hee doth admoniſh them, repentance and ſalvation are ill matched. And even ſuch an incongruity doth ſerve your turn, to blear both your own eyes and others alſo. If theſe were the things God leads men to by his works, and word, it were but in this manner, hee leads them to repentance that they may bee ſaved.

As for repentance it ſelf, admonition hereof the Apoſtle doth ſo manifeſtly attribute in ſuch ſort unto the miniſtry of his word as withall hee derogates it from the bare adminiſtration of his providence in his works, *Act.* 17. 30. *And the time of this ignorance God regarded not, but now hee admoniſheth all men every where to repent*; manifeſtly giving to underſtand that the Gentiles were not admoniſhed till now. In the time of extraordinary affliction, brought upon them by the adminiſtration of Gods providence in his works, men may bee ſtricken with feares that they have provoked a divine providence, and hereupon they may bee ſtirred up to take a courſe to pacifie the wrath of God according to that counſell. *Non te nullius exercent numinis iræ, &c.* therefore *faciles venerare Napæas: namque dabunt veniam votis iraſque remittent.*

But when they neither know God whom they have offended; nor the ſinne whereby they have provoked him, nor the right way to pacifie him; (as a Jew ſometimes being taken in a foule fact of colluſion, with the place where hee had been kindly intreated, and deſiring to make remonſtrance of his repentance, out of his familiarity with mee, came to mee privately, and inquired of mee what it was to repent, for ſaith hee, I doe faſt and macerate my body.)

This manner of admonition deſerves not to bee called an admonition to repentance. In ſuch a caſe the *Athenians* were ſome-

ſometimes brought about to erect an Altar to an unknown God; as much as to ſay, to pacifie they knew not whom, nor how, nor for what.

It is true, God is ſaid *Rom.* 1. 19. to manifeſt to the Gentiles that which may bee known of him, by his works. Yet not all that may bee known of him; for even the wiſdome of the world, after all their paines and ſtudious courſes, are ſaid not to have known God, no not in the wiſdome of God, 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. But his eternall power and God-head is generally made known to the world, ſufficiently to convict them of Idolatry: and the Apoſtle delivers no more in that place.

I hope wee Chriſtians by the help of Gods Word, are now adaies brought to ſuch a meaſure of underſtanding of God by his workes, that wee are able even by diſcourſe of reaſon to prove many a faire attribute of God, which the greateſt Philoſophers were ignorant of, though ſome things are found in them concerning the nature of God, which wee cannot read without admiration.

You adde alſo that God hath made manifeſt that which may bee known of him by his Law (alſo) writen in their hearts. Theſe you couple together, though little or nothing Homogeneall. The Law of God writen in our hearts, is concerning mans duty, no part whereof is contained in his Works.

His eternall power and God-head the Apoſtle tels us is made manifeſt by his works, no ſuch content doth hee make of the Law writen in our hearts, *Rom.* 2. 14. but when you ſay this is done to this end to move them to ſeek after the Lord, you fall upon the incongruity formerly ſpoken of. For the very adminiſtration of Gods providence, is the moving of them to ſeek after the Lord.

I ſay the adminiſtration of Gods providence in his works, moves men, as the Apoſtle ſignifies, to ſeek after the Lord. The Apoſtle no where refers this to the Law writen in mens hearts; but you put all together, and that for a ſpeciall purpoſe as it ſerves. For the phraſe of ſeeking after the Lord, *Act.* 17. ſeemes onely to import the ſeeking after his nature, manifeſted by his works; but you deſire (as it ſeemes) to bend it to denote ſuch a ſeeking after the Lord, as whereby to pacifie

him, and to finde mercy from him. In which ſenſe you ſay it was farre more accommodable to the Law of God writen in mans heart, then to the Adminiſtration of his providence in his works; and therefore you couple both theſe courſes together, and then aſſign the end of them both, to ſeek after the Lord; which through the ambiguous ſignification thereof, is applicable to both; though the Apoſtle utters it in ſuch a ſenſe onely, as whereby it is applyed to one courſe onely, namely to the adminiſtration of his providence in his works. Which yet I doe not conceive to proceed from any ill minde in you, but out of a deſire to hold our tenets up in that courſe of opinion which pleaſeth us, which is a common fault of all.

But with this difference; ſome affect thoſe opinions, which are moſt fit to humour fleſh and blood: but your aime (I am perſwaded) is onely to take a fit courſe to juſtifie God in his proceedings. Only you may bee pleaſed to remember, that it is nothing fit, wee ſhould *lie for God, as man doth for man, to gratifie him.*

As for the other end here ſpecified, of *Leading to Repentance*; this is neither appliable to that courſe of Gods providence, mentioned *Act.* 17. which is admoniſhing to ſeek the Lord, nor to that, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. but to a courſe different from both, namely, the conſideration of Gods patience and long-ſuffering, which yet without Gods word to inform us better, is far more fit to harden mens hearts in their ſinfull courſes, then to bring them to repentance. Which is a good reaſon to perſwade, that in this ſecond Chapter to the *Romans*, the Apoſtle makes a tranſition from the Gentiles to the Jews, from them which were nurtured and diſciplined onely by Gods works, to them which were nurtured alſo by the Miniſtery of his word. That in *Job* 33. 17. 29. of *with-drawing men from their courſes, healing their pride, and ſaving their ſoules from the pit*; You doe not well to confound the courſes taken for this there mentioned, with the bare adminiſtration of Gods providence in his works, or the writing of his Law in mens hearts, after a naturall manner. For the courſes there mentioned *by dreams and viſions*, and *by an interpreter*, were in thoſe dayes the onely meanes of grace. And then *Elihu* ſpeaks of Gods effectuall working

working of theſe gracious operations: to wit, *In withdrawing men from their ſinfull courſes*, to heale their pride, and ſave their ſoules from the pit. And wee can willingly grant, that God did intend that which hee would effectually bring to paſſe. But to ſay that God doth intend and will, that ſuch a thing ſhould come to paſſe, which never comes to paſſe, this wee take to bee a moſt indecent aſſertion, and ſpoiles God of his omnipotency, and plainly contradictious to that which your ſelf here profeſſe, in ſaying that God deprives the men of this world, of thoſe drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to Faith and Repentance. And with what ſobriety can it bee affirmed, that God wills their repentance and ſalvation, whom hee deprives of thoſe means, without which none can repent, that hee may bee ſaved? Yet for the making good of your aſſertion, I have often deviſed a commodious interpretation of your words, which you doe not, as namely thus; God uſeth ſuch or ſuch means to withdraw men from their courſe, to heal their pride, to ſave them from the pit. That is, to admoniſh them of their duty in turning from their wicked wayes, and humbling themſelves, that they may bee ſaved. And accordingly God may be ſaid to will it, with will of precept, not of purpoſe, *Voluntate præcepti, non propoſiti*; untill withall hee doth effect it, by giving thoſe drawing and effectuall meanes, without which none can repent.

Or laſtly, God may bee ſaid, by uſing ſuch courſes to intend, that they ſhould repent, and ſo bee ſaved, that is, that they ſhould (*Ex officio*, not *de facto*) repent, that they might bee ſaved. Thus to the Iſraelites hee did, and to his Church hee doth even to reprobates amongſt them; offer meanes of grace to purge them. Now by the operations of outward *meanes*, (which I think you ſignifie) and if you thereby comprehend the inward operation of Gods Spirit alſo, you doe not well to confound things ſo different under the ſame termes, (ſuch ambiguitie is ſo apt to deceive us) conſiſts only in inſtruction, and admonition, and exhortation or correption. Now theſe whether made to *turn us*, *Prov.* 1. 23. or *to gather us*, *Mat.* 23. 27. or *to convince us*, *Joh.* 16. 8, 9. are not of themſelves (as you know) effectuall to the converſion of any; though they are called in Scripture phraſe, the drawing of us with the Ezek. 24. 13.

cords of a man, and with the bonds of love, *Hoſe.* 11.4. And the dreſſing of us, *Eſa.*5.4. And your ſelfe profeſſe, that unleſſe God uſe thoſe drawing and effectuall means, no man can convert, no man can beleeve and repent.

Secondly, when you ſay, that the means which God uſeth for theſe ends, are in ſome meaſure ſufficient (if they bee not hindred by men) to bring them to the attainment of theſe things. This is worſe then ought you have delivered hitherto; yet you are to bee commended for dealing ſo plainly as you doe in this place, and no where elſe for ought I have found. But the more plainly you deale, the more foule doth your opinion appeare. I ſhould with a diſtinction, willingly confeſſe that the means God uſeth are ſufficient, to wit, in the way of inſtruction and admonition, ſo farre forth as God will have them (towards whom they are uſed) to bee inſtructed and admoniſhed: But this kinde of ſufficiency doth not depend on man, as if hee could hinder it.

Whether they will receive any inſtruction or no, the means are never a whit leſſe or more ſufficient in the way of inſtruction.

And indeed outward means tend no further, then to ſuch like operations as thus, (to wit) inſtruction, admonition, correption.

But when you make the ſufficiency of the means to depend on mans will, ſo as to bee hindred thereby, this muſt needs bee delivered of ſufficiency in reſpect of converſion, of bringing men unto faith and repentance.

And withall this is further to imply, that it is in the power of man by theſe means to bee converted unto God to beleeve and repent: which is a more foule tenet, then any you have delivered yet, though little truth hitherto have I found in this Diſcourſe throughout, ſaving in things merely delivered to no purpoſe. And withall it is plainly contradictious to that which here you expreſſely profeſſe, namely, that no man can beleeve and repent without ſome drawing and effectuall means, which are far different from the means here ſpoken of. For the meanes here ſpoken of, are ſuch as hee affords to Reprobates: but thoſe drawing and effectuall means, which hee affords onely to his Elect, as your ſelfe doe acknowledge;

wee

wee are ſo farre from denying them to bee ſufficient to the ends whereto hee intends them, as that wee willingly profeſſe, they are all effectuall (in their kinde) unto the ends, whereto hee intends them.

As for example, if God intends them for the converting of ſome unto God, all ſuch ſhall certainly bee converted; if only to the taking away of excuſe from others, they ſhall bee effectuall to the removing of excuſe; if to the bringing of ſome *ad exteriorem vitæ emendationem*, to an outward amendment of life and no further, they ſhall bee effectuall to that alſo and no further. And therefore wee doe nothing derogate from the wiſdome of God, but look you well unto it, that you doe not derogate from Gods omnipotency whileſt you maintain that ſome things are intended by God, which are never brought to paſſe, and that becauſe the will of man forſooth ſtands in reſiſtance unto Gods intention. Directly contrary to the Diſcourſe of *Auſtin*, *Enchir. cap. 96.* whoſe words are theſe, *Deo proculdubio, quam facile eſt quod vult facere, tam facile eſt, quod non vult eſſe, non ſinere. Hoc niſi credamus, periclitatur ipſum noſtræ fidei confeſſionis initium, qua nos in Deum Patrem omnipotentem credere confitemur. Neque enim ob aliud veraciter vocatur omnipotens, niſi quia quicquid vult poteſt, nec voluntate cujuſquam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus.* And if it bee ſo as you profeſſe; That *no man can come to Chriſt, except the Father draw him; by the ſame Almighty authority and power, whereby hee ſent Chriſt into the world*; and withall if you adde thereunto, as elſe-where you doe, that *this power* (I leave out authority as of an alien ſignification) *is ſhewed onely in drawing his Elect*, what need all theſe paines that you have taken, ſince it is cleare, that ſo long as you hold to this, you ſhall never ſatisfie any Pelagian or Arminian? and all the abſurdities they charge our Doctrine with, are directed againſt this.

But well you may puzzle the wits, and trouble the minde of many an Orthodox and well-affected Chriſtian, with ſo intricate a diſcourſe, labouring to deviſe a new way to juſtifie our Doctrine of Election by ſo tempering the Doctrine of reprobation, as utterly to overthrow your own Orthodox opinion, in the very point of election, as I have already ſhewed, as occaſion hath been given.

Object. How then (will you say) can these two stand together? there is a sufficiency and power in the meanes, to lead the men of this world to the knowledge of God, and to grace in Christ, and yet there is an impotency, yea an impossibility in the men of the world to come to Christ, without greater and stronger means then these bee?

Answ. For answer whereto I will not content my self to say, that these means are sufficient, because they suffice to leave men without excuse; onely in the second place, and by accident, after, when men have neglected to make so good use of them as they might have done: but you see that God aimes at other ends in the first and principall place. *viz.* to lead them to repentance to save their soules from the pit, as the places alledged give evident witnesse: and for these ends it is that these means must bee acknowledged and conceived as sufficient. For else the Word of God argued an imperfection or insufficiency of such meanes to their proper ends. I think it safe to say, these means are sufficient, *ex parte Dei*, on Gods behalf, to manifest the will of God, rather to desire repentance and life, then the hardning and destruction of the Creature. And *ex parte hominum*, in regard of men, sufficient to inable them to the performance of such duties, in which their naturall consciences would excuse them, and in which way they might the sooner finde mercy, mercy vouchsafing more powerfull and more effectuall helps, whilest they walk according to the knowledge and helps, which they have received, and sin not against conscience, but only out of ignorance in the state of unbeleef.

Exam. It is *Arminius* his superficiary conceit, that *Hortatio non facta sed spreta*, makes a man inexcusable, not considering that admonition and instruction it self, takes away excuse, although none have need of excuse, but they that doe evill. For the excuse is this, *si scissem fecissem*, or, *si audivissem credidissem*; now this excuse is manifestly removed by the preaching of the Gospel. And the word inexcusable, though it formally signifie without excuse, yet withall it connotates a condition delinquent, and such as had need of excuse, though bereaved thereof, and such a condition ariseth from the contempt of the means of grace.

Neither is this condition by accident, like as the neglecting

ing to make good uſe of them is not by accident.

For God intending to deprive them of thoſe drawing and effectuall helpes, without which none can make good uſe of them, did never intend they ſhould make good uſe of them, but rather the contrary, inaſmuch as hee purpoſed not to ſhew that mercy towards them which hee ſhews towards his Elect, but rather to harden them. As the Lord tells *Ezek.* Chap. 2. 4. *They are impudent children, and ſtiffe-hearted. I doe ſend thee unto them, and thou ſhalt ſay unto them; Thus ſaith the Lord God. But ſurely they will not heare, neither indeed will they ceaſe; for they are a rebellious houſe, yet ſhall they know, that there hath been a Prophet among them.*

So that albeit the Lord knew full well what ſorry entertainment his Prophets ſhould finde, yet would hee not give way to any ſuch excuſe as this; If the Lord had ſent his Prophet to admoniſh us of our wandrings from him wee would ſoon have turned unto the good way of the Lord.

No, they ſhall know there hath been a Prophet among them.

And as for the ground of this his fore-knowledge, *Eſay* manifeſteth this to bee Gods purpoſe to harden them, *Eſa.* 6. 9. *Goe and ſay unto this people, yee ſhall heare indeed, but ſhall not underſtand, yee ſhall plainly ſee and not perceive; make the heart of this people fat, and make their eares heavy, and ſhut their eyes, leſt they ſee with their eyes, and heare with their eares, and underſtand with their hearts, and convert, and I ſhall heale them.* What place is here for ſuch conceites of leaving men without excuſe in a ſecond place, and that by accident?

Yet if you can prove that God did intend any better thing unto them in a firſt place, wee ſhall bee willing to confeſſe that this comes in, in a ſecond place.

You ſay, God leads them to repentance to ſave them from the pit.

I anſwer this leading to repentance, *Rom.* 2. is onely his ſparing them in their ſins, and admoniſhing them to repent; and this wee ſay is done to the Reprobates, not with any purpoſe to bring them to repentance: for if God had any ſuch purpoſe, hee would not deprive them of thoſe helpes without which none can come to repentance as your ſelf profeſſe hee doth: and if hee had any ſuch purpoſe to bring them to repentance

pentance and yet doth not, it followeth that hee cannot.

And if hee hath any such purpose, either this purpose must continue still in God, even after their damnation, or otherwise God must bee charged with mutability, all which you consider not, much lesse accommodate any tolerable answer thereto.

For the same reason I deny that God hath any intention or purpose to save them: how can hee? considering that from everlasting hee hath ordained them to condemnation.

And of this also you take no notice, much lesse goe about to shape any convenient answer thereunto; carrying the matter all along in such manner, as if Gods decree of their condemnation were not conceived, untill the means of Grace offered are found to bee finally despised.

Neither doe the places alledged by you, give any testimony to these your uncouth assertions, much lesse evident testimony. Indeed I blame you not for desiring your Reader would take them so, to save your paines of proving it. For you take no pains at all to inforce any place, by Logicall argumentation to give evidence to such a sense you put upon them, though it stand in manifest opposition to the nature of God even to the bereaving him both of his omnipotency and immutability, to make him to contradict himself, and strangely to go about to perswade the world that God intends the repentance of those men, to whom hee denies those helps, without which none can repent, as your self also acknowledge.

So that wee need not to bee put to deny the sufficiency of Gods word to those ends whereunto God hath given it, which is to instruct in all points of Faith and duties of life; and to admonish us to give obedience unto it, and reprove them that doe not; and consequently to take away all excuse for want of any of these gratious operations. And thus it is sufficient *ex parte Dei*, and *ex parte hominum* too, as for God to admonish thereby, and men to bee admonished and instructed.

But otherwise to require any thing on mans part to adde sufficiency to God, is too too absurd.

For whether man doth yeeld obedience, the word is never a whit the more sufficient, or whether hee yeelds not obedience, the word is never the lesse sufficient.

As

As for the desire of the Repentance and life of Reprobates which you attribute unto God, you keep your course I confesse in strange expressions, manifestly contradictious to the nature of God, and to your self.

Can you perswade your self that ever the world will bee brought about to beleeve, or any intelligent or sober man amongst them, that God desires the repentance and life of them, whom hee hath determined from everlasting to deprive of those helps without which no man can repent and bee saved? yet that hee doth deprive them hereof, it is your own most expresse profession in the former Section.

As for hardning them, doth hee not harden whom hee will? and hath hee not from everlasting ordained all Reprobates unto destruction? As for any desire hereof in God, I account it a very absurd thing, to treat of any will in God under the notion of desire in proper speech; Speak wee of the desires of weak men, who cannot effect what they will, but bee advised to spare to attribute any desires to God in proper speech, as you would spare to attribute to him, eyes and ears, and hands, and heart, in proper speech, and though God bee pleased in condescension to our capacities to take upon him our infirmities, let us not recompence his goodnesse so ill, as to conceive of his nature as obnoxious to the same imperfections whereto our natures are: When you say that the Word inables not onely the Elect, but others to perform such duties, and having but erst spoken of the duty of repentance, and this being delivered in the same breath, whereto doth this tend, but to work in your Reader an opinion, that even Reprobates are inabled by the Word to perform the duty of Repentance? which you know full well cannot bee affirmed by you without palpable contradiction to your self, as well as to the truth of God, and therefore I wonder not a little what you mean to carry your self in this your Discourse in such sort as to draw so neere to such foule assertions. Therefore you forbeare to name particularly the duty of Repentance, but flee to generalls and say that Reprobates are inabled by the Word, to perform such duties as their naturall conscience would excuse them.

And I confesse that, as [illegible] taught mee, even without

the word naturall men are inabled to doe some duties wherein their naturall conscience doth excuse them, as namely, in doing the things contained in the Law, and that by nature, mark that well, I beseech you, that you may see the uncouthnesse of that which follows, as when you say; And in that way they sooner finde mercy. For what? is a man by nature able to perform some things whereby hee may the sooner finde mercy? Was ever mercy found at the hand of God by performing some duty by power of nature? What revelation of God hath taught you this? that a work of nature should further us to obtaining the mercy of God? I speak of morall works of nature, not of naturall, such as are to goe to Church and to heare a Sermon; to goe, and to heare, are actions naturall, not morall, unlesse they bee considered as joyned with affections and intentions morall. And to go to Church and heare a Sermon, with ill affections and intentions, as namely either to mock, or to take a nap, is a naturall way I confesse, whereby a man may and doth finde mercy farre sooner, then by keeping at home, though never so civilly imployed. And therefore Father *Latimer* reprehending some for comming to Church to take a nap, yet saith hee, let them come, for they may bee taken napping, which is as much as to say, they may finde mercy at the hands of God whilest they are napping.

Yet I presume you will not say, that so to come to Church, is the performing of a duty whereby they may finde mercy sooner.

In the next place you indirectly imbrace the sower leaven of Arminianisme, plainly professing that God doth vouchsafe more powerfull effectuall helps to them that walk according to the knowledge and helps they have received. As if that of our Saviour *Habenti dabitur*, to him that hath shall bee given, you did interpret especially after the same manner, as *Arminius* doth, to wit, that if men use their naturals right, God will give them meanes of grace; But here is the difference, they speak their minde plainely, you carry your Discourse, that wee are driven to groape (as in the dark) after your meaning. For you deliver this of Reprobates, who doe already injoy the Word, the meanes of grace; And therefore

fore the more powerfull helps you speak of, are not outward means, (for that they injoy already) but inward grace. As if God had ordained that grace should bee given according unto works, which is direct Pelagianisme. And withall you imply a power in Reprobates to walk according to knowledge, and helpes already received, to wit, under the means of grace; And what can this bee lesse, then a power to beleeve and repent. How many a godly mans heart would bleed to understand so foule assertions to drop from the pen of such a man as your self?

In fine, you adde a new qualification of the way to finde mercy the sooner, and that is, not to sin against conscience, but onely of ignorance, and withall by the coherence imply, that even reprobates and unregenerate persons have power to keep themselves from sinning against their conscience, and so to keep themselves as to sin onely through ignorance. Whence it manifestly followeth, that in such a case of performance which you esteem possible, either the conscience of a naturall man shall not convict him of any sin, or convicting him of sin, shall not convict him, that hee ought to repent of it.

Or lastly, it followeth, that hee hath power to repent. The two first are unreasonable; to affirm the last, is to contradict your self, having lately professed, that *God deprives all save his Elect of those helps and means, without which none can repent*. And truely it seems, in denying the power of repenting unto the world, you did not well consider what you delivered; for the face of your Discourse seemes to lead to the contrary, namely, to the maintaining that it is in the power of a naturall man to repent though hee bee in the state of unbeleefe.

Where again, in signifying that you speak of a man in the state of unbeleef, you confound, if not your self (yet) I am sure your Reader. For but erst you discoursed how men of the world are inabled by Gods Word to the performance of such duties in which their naturall conscience would excuse them. Now I should think, they that injoy the Word of God, and are thereby so inabled as you speak, are not to bee accounted in the state of unbeleefe, which I should think is a state peculiar unto heathens, who have not so much as an outward profession of Christianity. In like sort it is your course

to confound the inward operation of Gods Spirit with the outward means, and comprehend them both under the terms of means and helps, which have no univocall notion common unto them. It is bad enough to hold ones self to generals; considering, that may bee verifyed of one species which cannot bee verifyed of another, but it is too too bad to confound those under generall termes, that have no more univocation between them then creation, and exhortation.

Another confusion I finde abuseth your fancy in this very Section, and that is spread all over it like a Leprosie. For whereas the objection arising naturally from the former discourse, is grounded upon a seeming contradiction, in professing a naturall man to bee impotent to perform faith and repentance; and yet giving power to a man to attaine those ends, whereunto the means given tend, namely, to his conversion and salvation: instead of comparing the sufficiency you give to man with the sufficiency you deny to man, and therewithall shewing how the one doth not contradict the other; I say instead of comparing these, you compare the sufficiency of the means with the impotency of man, to convert and bee saved; which you expresse by comming to Christ. Varying your phrases at every turn, which is good for nothing but to trouble disputation. Whereas indeed there is no question to bee made of the sufficiency of the means, (if by means you understand the word of the Gospel) in that kinde, wherein means are capable of sufficiency, to wit, in the way of instruction, exhortation, reprehension, beyond which kinde of operations their sufficiency doth not extend.

The question is onely of the sufficiency of man to perform what the means doe move us unto.

I confesse under means you comprehend, not only the book of grace, which is Gods word, but the book of Nature also, which is Gods works, the sufficiency whereof to inform either, as touching the nature of God or duty of man, wee utterly deny, neither are you able to prove. And therefore you doe not so well to carry it in the generall, seeing as touching the specials, it is true of the one, not of the other. And in such cases the issue of generalls, is rather to circumvent a simple Reader then to inform.

And yet as touching that undue comparison by you made, and formerly mentioned; you doe not carry it so cleanly, but that by the way you supplant your self; as when you speak of the sufficiency of the means, to the ends formerly mentioned, except they bee hindered by men. For it cannot bee understood of bringing a man passively to those ends, to wit, unto repentance. For man neither is nor can bee meerely passive in repentance, but must bee active also. Nay, for ought I see, you make him passive therein, onely in respect of instruction, and exhortation, which nothing hinders, but that hee may bee altogether active in performing repentance, if hee will. Sith then repentance is the end whereto these means tend, and the means are sufficient to bring any to repentance (as you avouch) except they bee hindred by men, it must necessarily follow, that man hath power by these means to attain to these ends whereto these means lead him, if hee will; and consequently hath power to repent, and to obtain grace in Christ, if hee will; for the means lead thereunto, namely, to the knowledge of God and grace in Christ, as your self have professed in expresse terms.

And consequently when you say to the contrary, that there is an impotency, yea, an impossibility in the men of this world to come to Christ, without greater and stronger means then these bee; you doe directly contradict your self, neither will all the labour following, expressing your selfe in various phrasiologies, serve turn to free you from this contradiction, but leave men suspitious that you affirm this contradiction onely in words, but the contrary potency, you maintain in deed. And because that without all tergiversation you professe, that such men have power to perform something, upon the performance whereof they might the sooner finde mercy; I beseech you in the feare of God no longer to abuse your self and others in speaking thus indefinitely, but tell us plainly and particularly, what that is which (you say) Reprobates have power to perform, and upon the performance whereof they should finde mercy. To confesse my bold weaknesse, ingenuously I am perswaded you are not able to define any such particular; if you should, it will not satisfie to the full, unlesse withall you explicate your self, and shew whether that work you speake

of hee a worke of nature, or a worke of grace. If a worke of grace, then an unregenerate man is not so farre dead in sin, but hee is able to perform a worke of grace, and if hee bee able to perform one worke of grace, why not two, why not twenty? If a worke of nature onely, then seeing hereupon you say hee shall finde mercy, you fall foule upon that which was censured in the Synod of *Palestine* one thousand two hundred yeares agoe, namely, that grace is given according unto works. If some may say on your behalf, that you doe not say they shall finde mercy in this case, but onely that they shall the sooner finde mercy: or if this like not, if any shall otherwise plead in this manner; namely, that you doe not say that hee shall finde mercy in this case, but hee might finde mercy; I will bid him content himself, and expect while you warrant such Apologies, and then I doubt not, but hee shall waite long enough, for I am confident you are farre off from maintaining such foule collusions.

By the way give mee leave to wonder that you expresse your self in such a manner. But alas, what should wee look for when the cause is no better? and yet a gracious respect unto a gracious end, namely, the justifying of Gods proceedings, hath cast a good man upon such a course. So dangerous a thing it is when a man is to seek in some particulars, not to content himself with acknowledgment thereof, and to waite upon God for a time of revelation, but to cut out his own way in seeking satisfaction.

Answ. Thirdly, the men of this world doe not walk answerably to the means they have received, neither doe they imploy or use these talents to such advantage as they might. The Gentiles though they knew God, yet they glorified him not as God, but became unthankfull and vain in their imaginations, they did not like to retaine God in their knowledge; but to detain the truth in unrighteousnesse.

Rom.1.21.28.

The Jews resisted the Holy Ghost, despised the messengers and word of God, acknowledged not the day and meanes of their own peace, refusing him and all his benefits, preferring a murtherer and false prophet before him, brought forth wilde grapes of injustice and oppression instead of the sweet grapes of righteousnesse and judgement. In this they abused the talents

Act.7,51. Luk.19.24. Mat.27.21,22 Joh.3.43.

lents and meanes of Grace in a worse manner then could bee excused by any necessity or impotency of corrupt nature. Corrupt nature resisting not, but by these helps they might have avoided these sinnes which they fell into, and might have reached to the performance of these duties, for the neglect of which they are here reproved for comming short of. Yea, *Plato* himselfe would have brought forth better fruit, then some of these which the Jews yeelded, but that the Jews themselves prevailed with him for worse.

To speake plainely, that phrases doe not deceive us, it is true, that the men of the world doe not live according to their knowledge, nor abstaine from foule sinnes, from which they might abstaine. But what if they did? should they finde mercy the sooner? for unlesse you make this good, you say nothing to the purpose. Therefore to the maintenance of this you tended in the former Section, but all in vaine. For consider, why then did not the Philosophers find mercy, *Plato*, *Socrates*, *Phocion*, the most morall men of the world? Again, did any of these abstaine from any foule sinne in a gracious manner, or out of their love to God? Look to *Isocrates* his incitements to morality; what are they other then the reward of praise and applause of the world? and why, I pray you, should God regard them any whit the more for this? nay, did they not look for justification by this? all their goodnesse did they not attribute to their own Free will? and why should not God hate them the more for this? Doe not Publicans and Harlots (and did not our Saviour tell us as much) enter into the kingdome of Heaven before Scribes and Pharisees? Bee it so, that the men of the world were Fornicators when they might have forborn it: were Idolaters, but might have abstained from that: were Adulterers, Wantons, Buggerers, and might have kept themselves pure from such abominations: were theeves, when they might have abstained from laying hands on their neighbours goods; were covetous, yet might have contemned the world as many did: were Drunkards, yet might have tempered themselves from such excesse: were Railers, yet might have ordered their tongues: were Extortioners, yet might have been more mercifull then so. Now I pray you tell me, were not the elect of God such also? See

Exam.

what

what the Apostle saith in reference to every one of these particulars, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *And such were some of you, but yee are washed, but yee are justifyed, but yee are sanctifyed in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God.* Nay, how many a naturall man was more morall, then to be guilty of so foule pollutions, as many of Gods elect have been conscious of, yet never found mercy at the hands of God. If otherwise, God should call men not so much according to his purpose and grace, as according to workes; directly contrary to *Pauls* text, 1 *Tim.* 1. 9. And what then should become of that, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardneth?* *Rom.* 9. 18.

As for the fault you mention of the Gentiles, was it not common to the Elect as well as to the Reprobates? What saith *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. *Yee know yee were Gentiles, and were carryed away unto dumb Idols even as ye were led.* Yet the *Romans* for above a hundred years had no Images, as *Varro* testifies, saying, That then the Gods were worshipped *castius*, more chastly, and that they who brought in Images, *timorem ademerunt, errorem auxerunt*, took away the feare of God, and increased the errour concerning the nature of God. Yet in these dayes of Image-worship, thousands were from Idols turned to serve the living God, 1 *Thess.* 1. 8. in those former daies not one that we read of.

Wee come to the Jews; bee it so, that they were worse then *Pilate*, yet many of them in despight of their sinnes were converted unto Christ; I say, of them that crucified him, and preferred a murtherer before him; *Pilate* was not; at least wee have a record of the conversion of the one, *Acts* 2. none of the other. Yea *Saul* breathing nothing but wrath and fury against the Church of God, as *Ferox scelerum*, *Quia prima proveneant*, being heartned with the blood of *Stephen*, as with a cup of sweet Wine, was converted unto Christ, when many a morall, quiet, peaceable, and nothing factious Jew, had not the mercy shewed him that *Saul* had. They abused (you say) their talents and meanes of grace, in a worse manner then could bee excused (yet who worse then *Saul* or *Manasses*) by any necessity or impotency of corrupt nature. But who I pray goes about to excuse them this way? wee certainly excuse them not,

no,

no, nor they themſelves neither; for it were moſt incongruous they ſhould, even as if *Epicures* ſhould complain of the ſweet morſels which they roule under their tongues, that they are ſo ſweet, that they cannot forbeare to bee in love with them. But will you deny God to have a hand in hardning them, to the committing of ſo foule exceſſe? what is the meaning of giving over to vile affections? to doe things inconvenient, and that in an abominable kind? and that to what end but this, that ſo they might receive the juſt recompence of their errour? yet that errour is well known to have been incident, as well to the very elect of God, as unto Reprobates. By the way you ſignifie, that by the neglect of the helpes and meanes afforded them, they fell ſhort of theſe duties, to the performance whereof they might have reached. Their ſin was in doing contrary to their knowledge and conſcience upon due information out of Gods Word; this is to neglect the meanes; And conſequently to uſe the meanes aright, was to doe accordingly as they were informed. And indeed, if they had done otherwiſe then they did, they had not done ſo bad as they did. I finde ſuch giddineſſe of diſcourſe uſually amongſt the *Arminians*, while they ſatisfie themſelves with phraſes, never examining particularly, the matter and ſubſtance of their own expreſſions.

Becauſe of the abuſe of theſe talents and meanes of grace, God therefore doth deny to the men of this world ſuch powerfull and gracious helpes, as hee vouchſafeth freely to the Elect, to draw them on effectually to repentance and ſalvation. *Anſw.*

The Gentiles abuſing the light of nature, God gave them up to vile affections, yea, even to a reprobate minde. Rom. 1. 29.

The Phariſees becauſe they employed the talent of their wealth unfaithfully, God would not truſt them with the true riches. Luk. 16. 11, 12.

The Jews becauſe they rejected Chriſt, and his Word, and his Meſſengers, with ſcornfull and bitter malignity, and brought forth grapes of gall and wormwood; therefore God took his Word from them, and hid from them the things that did belong unto their peace; hee took the kingdome of God from them, and gave them as a prey to ſinne, and miſery, and deriſion, *Pſal.* 81. 11, 12. What if none of the world (as oppoſed Acts 16. 46. Luke 19. 42. Mat. 21 41, 42.

to the Elect) ever came to Christ, or made such use of the means and helpes offered in him unto them, as to obtaine salvation and regenerating grace by him; yet might they have made better use of the means then they did, which because they did not, it was just with God to deny them greater means, who thus abused the lesser.

Exam. In all this wee have as pure Arminianisme tendred unto us, as could drop from the pen of *Arminius* himselfe, or *Corvinus*. Yet God forbid wee should *eo nomine*, for that cause dislike it. If truth, wee must embrace it, though it come out of the mouth of the Devill. If falshood, wee shall by Gods grace disclaim it, though it proceed out of the mouth of Angels of light, and not disclaim it onely, but disprove it also. You may as well say that God doth not draw the men of this world effectually to Repentance, because they doe abuse the talents and means of grace, but this I disprove thus.

First, if this bee the cause why God doth not draw them to repentance, then this is the cause why hee sheweth not to them that mercy which hee doth to the Elect, but this is not the cause thereof, which I prove thus. The meer pleasure of God is the cause; therefore that is not. The antecedent thus; God shews mercy on whom hee will, and hardens, (that is, denies mercy) to whom hee will. If to harden were not to deny mercy, it could not stand in opposition to shewing mercy. The consequence I demonstrate thus. If to deny mercy to whom hee will, doth not inferre that mercy is not denyed according unto works: then to shew mercy to whom hee will, doth not inferre, that mercy is not shewed according unto works.

Secondly, if mens evill works were the cause why God denies them mercy, then it could not bee said, that God denies mercy, because it is the pleasure of his will to deny it. For if a reason bee demanded why a malefactor is hanged, it were very absurd to answer, that the reason is, because it was the pleasure of the Magistrate to have him hanged.

Thirdly, if evill works bee the deserving cause, why Gods mercy is denyed unto men, then either by necessity of nature, or by constitution of God. Not by necessity of nature, in opposition to the constitution of God, for then by necessity of

nature,

nature God must bee compelled to deny mercy unto such, what then shall become of Gods Elect? unlesse you will say, that their workes before mercy shewed them, were not so bad as others, which were equally to contradict both experience and the Word of God. For in this case men should have mercy shewed on them, according to their works, to wit, as they were found lesse evill then the works of others. Nor by constitution of God.

For first, shew mee any such constitution, that men in such a condition of evill works shall bee denyed mercy.

Secondly, by the same constitution, mercy should bee denyed to the Elect also. When you speak of the Gentiles (in this case) abusing the light of Nature, and given over to vile affections, you take your aime miserably amisse: For the Gentiles are not the men of the world in opposition to the Elect. But God forbid, that the Gentiles, and the men of the world, should be terms convertible in this kinde, for then what should become of us?

Certainly the number of Gods Elect is greater amongst the Gentiles, then among the Jews, and even of those that were given over to vile affections, some were Elect, as appears 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10, 11. And to say that the cause why God denies them mercy, was, because they abused the light of nature, I have freshly disproved this, and that evidently, as I presume the intelligent Reader will observe, though the contrary (I confesse) bee very plausible at the first sight, and before wee come to the discussing of it.

Thirdly, you take your aime amisse also (though not in so great measure as in the former) in the phrase: For even of the Pharisees some were Elect, witnesse holy Paul, Who abused his zeale of the Law more foully then hee? even to the persecuting of Gods Church? yet was not the true treasure denyed to him, and that in the highest measure. And as for Reprobates, if you think their unfaithfulnesse in the use of their wealth, was the cause why mercy was denyed them: for the disproofe hereof, I refer mee to my former arguments.

Fourthly, the very Elect of God, not onely rejected Christ for a time, but also crucifyed him. That which you urge of Gods taking his word and kingdom (in plain terms the means

of grace) from such a Nation as contemns them, is nothing to the purpose. For wee treat of Gods shewing and denying mercy, not in the means, but as touching the grace it self of Repentance. But this benefit you have confounded, by comprehending both under the name of meanes and helpes, for your advantage, to passe from the one to the other, as you see good. Here indeed it is as true, that because men doe make precious account of the means of grace, therefore God continueth these means unto them: like as because of mens perseverance in Faith, and Repentance, and good works, God rewards them with everlasting life; like as because men die in their sins, therefore God inflicts on them everlasting death. Onely with this difference; Sin on the one side is the meritorious cause both of withdrawing the means of grace, and of damnation: but conscionable walking before God in the use of the means, is only the disposing cause both to the continuance of the means, and to eternall salvation. For God by
Col. 1. grace makes us meet partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in Light. Forthwith you return to the right state of the question, to wit, in the concession or denegation of regenerating grace, but carry your self in shew very prejudicially to the freenesse of Gods grace; as when you say, What if no Reprobate made such use of the means and helps offered as to obtain regenerating grace? Dangerously implying that there is a certain use of the means, *quo posito*, which being put, regenerating grace should bee obtained. As if grace regenerating were to bee dispensed according to an unregenerate persons works. Of the same leaven savour your words following, when you say, *That because they did not make better use of the means, it was just with God to deny them greater means*, saving that here you may bee relieved by the ambiguity of the word means, by shifting from one sense of it to another. For if means bee taken in the same kinde, to wit, of outward means, like as it is just with God to reward the right use of smaller meanes, with the bestowing of greater, so it is just with God, for the abuse of the smaller, not onely to deny greater, but to take away those smaller.

But as touching the granting, or denying grace regenerative, herein God carryeth himself meerely according to the good

pleasure

pleasure of his own will, according to that of the Apostle, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardneth.* Neither can it bee otherwise; For as much as mercy in regenerating any man, cannot bee shewed according unto good works, and consequently the denying of mercy cannot proceed according to evill works, as I have already demonstrated in the first place.

The Sixth Doubt.

Question, 6.

HOw may it appeare, that the declaration of the equity and sufficiency of Gods justice is reall, and not pretended, since all things are carryed and come to passe, by an absolute and unconditionall decree, and providence: *exempli gratia*, that fact, *Act.* 4.28. & 2.23.

Answer. To say that God carryeth all things by an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence, *viz.* opposing absolute to all conditions presupposed in the creature, in my judgment is neither agreeing to the Doctrine of Scripture, nor of our Divines; who doe both teach that as God in the fulnesse of time doth administer and dispense the way of his providence, so hee decreed to dispense them in the same manner from eternity. Now in dispensing the performance of the Covenant of works, the Lord punisheth and rewardeth the creature according to the condition of obedience or disobedience performed by it, as it is at large described *Levit.* 26. *Deut.* 28. and therefore surely he decreed to carry such works of his providence upon the same conditions.

The places that may bee alledged to the contrary, do speak of Gods Decree in delivering Christ to death for us, which as it was a work of meere grace, you may safely conceive it was decreed by an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence, as generally the works of free grace are. For either they depend on no condition in the creature, or at least on none but such as God is pleased to work in us, and for us. And yet I believe that in your own judgement you think not that

God did decree the death of Christ, much lesse deliver him to death, but upon condition of *Adams* fall. If you say, God did as well decree a sinfull manner of the death of Christ by the hands of the wicked, as the death it self, and that by an absolute, an unconditionall decree. I answer, if you mean an unconditionall decree, presupposing no condition in those creatures, which were the wicked instruments of his death, it is spoken without warrant either from those places, or from any other. That God gave up *Judas* to betray him, it was the punishment of his covetousnesse and hypocrisie. That God gave up the high Priests and Pharisees to conspire against him, to deliver him to *Pilate*, it was the punishment of their ambition and envy, and in some of them their sin against the Holy Ghost. That *Pilate* against his conscience gave judgement against him, it was the judgement of his carnall popularity and his worldly feare of Cæsar. That the common people and Souldiers cryed out against him, and laid violent hands on him, it was the punishment of their ignorance and infidelity. Now it is out of all controversie that God doth not punish sin with sin, nor decree to punish, but upon condition of sin presupposed. It is true indeed, God worketh all things after the counsell of his will; but that proveth not that God carryeth all things with an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence. For it is the counsell of his will, as to work the salvation of his Elect according to the Covenant of Grace, freely and absolutely; so to dispense rewards and punishments to the men of this world according to the condition of their obedience or disobedience.

There is therefore no place left for such a question, *viz.* How it may appeare, that the declaration of the equity of Gods Justice was not pretended, but reall, since all things are carryed and come to passe by an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence. For neither are all things (as it is evident) so carryed, and if they were, I had rather such a question should come out of the mouth of an Arminian, then of any godly and judicious Brother.

The Arminians you knew upon a seeming faire pretence, are wont to object against our Divines, that God calleth the Reprobates rather *simulate* then *serio*, in semblance rather then in truth,

truth; if hee hath before determined of them, by an absolute and unconditionall decree. But the same answer your selfe would return to their objection, the same I return to your question, with more probability, (yea, I may truly say) with more safety.

That no will of God is conditionall, we have the concurrent consent both of young and Popish Divines. For both *Piscator* maintaines it against *Vorstius*, and *Bradwardine* demonstrates it: And this condition which you speake of, can be no lesse then some motive cause: & *Aquinas* hath professed that never any was so madde, as to affirm that there was any cause of Predestination, *quoad actum praedestinandi*, as touching the act of God predestinating, and that for no other reason then because there can be no cause of the will of God, *quoad actum voluntis*, as touching the act of God willing. Whence it followeth manifestly, that in like sort there can bee no cause of reprobation neither *quoad actum reprobandi*, as touching the act of God reprobating: and consequently no condition. *Exam.*

As for the contrary allegations out of Scripture, and out of Divines, I shall be content to consider them, whensoever you shall produce them; but I am perswaded you will not bee forwards to trouble your selfe thereabout, after I shall present unto you how incongruous a course you take to the justifying of that which here you affirme. And not incongruous onely, but most dangerous, tending manifestly to the utter overthrow of the Freenesse of Gods grace in Predestination; which indeed very frequently you shake in this unhappy discourse of yours. As *God in fulnesse of time doth administer and dispence the wayes of his providence, so* (you say) *hee decreed to dispence them in the same manner from all eternity.* Wee grant it willingly; but what of all this? you adde, that *in dispencing the performance of the Covenant of workes, the Lord punisheth and rewardeth the creature according to the condition of obedience or disobedience performed by it, or rather by the person under it*: This also wee willingly grant. But what doe you inferre herehence? onely this; *Therefore surely hee decreed to vary such workes of his providence upon the same conditions.* Now this conclusion we embrace as readily as your selfe; but this is farre from justifying the decree of God to bee conditionall. Nay, your selfe doe plainly expresse, that the carriage of

such

such workes of his providence is upon such conditions: Not that Gods decree is upon such conditions: which is as much as to say in plaine termes, that the execution of his decree proceeds upon condition, not the decree it selfe. Yet I confesse, in the same manner *Arminius* himselfe and his followers discourse; as if they would explicate themselves in this manner of argumentation. *Sinne alwayes goes before damnation; therefore a respect to sinne goes before Gods decree of damnation;* As if wee should argue thus. Faith in men of ripe yeares alwayes goeth before salvation: therefore a respect unto faith alwayes goeth before Gods decree of salvation. Doe you not perceive by this the dangerous issue of your argumentation? yet this is the very thing they aime at: this is the *Helena* they are enamoured with. But I am confident you are farre from this, and would not a little grieve to understand, that the Orthodox faith of some in the very point of predestination, is not a little shaken by such argumentations as these. And the rather, because they have found such an eminent man as your selfe, not onely to swallow them, but in a confidentiary manner to propose them as most sound to give satisfaction unto others. Therefore *Aquinas* fairely distinguisheth of the cause or condition of Gods will, either *quoad actum volentis*, as touching the act of God willing, or *quoad res volitas*, as touching the things willed; no cause or condition thereof, *quoad actum volentis*; there may be *quoad res volitas*. As for example, to give instance in predestination, no cause thereof at all, *quoad actum praedestinantis*, as touching the act of God predestinating; there may be a cause thereof *quoad res p edestinatione praeparatas*, as touching the things prepared by predestination. As for example: Grace may bee, and is the cause of glory, and Christs merits may be, and are the cause of grace. So of Reprobation no cause thereof at all, *quoad actum reprobantis*, as touching the act of God reprobating, no more then of the will of God, *quoad actum volentis*, as touching the act of God willing: But there is a cause thereof, *quoad res reprobatione praeparatas*, as touching the things prepared by Reprobation, as sin is the cause of condemnation. And indeed many confound these, and thereupon professe the will of God in some cases to bee conditionall, the issue whereof is no more then this, That some

things

things which God will have to come to passe, shall not come to passe but upon condition. Thus *Vossius* understands *voluntas conditionata*, a conditionate will, which hee attributeth unto God, not considering how handsomely he contradicts himself. And Doctor *Jackson* of *Providence*, discoursing of *voluntas antecedens & consequens*, will antecedent and consequent, premiseth that the distinction is to be understood *non quoad actum volentis*, not touching the act of God willing, but *quoad res volitas*, as touching the things willed; though his discourse hereupon bee nothing suitable. A manifest evidence that hee understood not the distinction any more then *Vossius* did.

You are willing to acknowledge that Gods decree of delivering Christ to death, was absolute, as a work of meere grace. As for the condition of *Adams* fall to bee premised to this decree, sure I am, that is not your Opinion: neither doth it become any to maintaine any decree of God to be both unconditionall and conditionall. And why that sinne more then any other for which Christ satisfied should be imagined to bee premised as a condition of this decree; I see no reason: and if every sin must bee presupposed, why not the sin of crucifying Christ? This sin started *Arminius*; and this is it, and this alone, which he thinkes good to except in this case. I doe nothing wonder that his learning and his honesty were so well met both of a very temperate nature. But albeit the fall of *Adam* was not preconceived to this decree of delivering of Christ to death; yet I am not of your Opinion, who thinke hereupon, that the decree of sending Christ into the world, was before the decree of permitting *Adams* fall: concerning which I have discoursed enough, while I examined how well you cleared the first doubt. But when you distinguish of Gods decree to deliver Christ to death, and to deliver him to a sinfull death; you take a course to make mad work amongst Gods decrees. As if God did first intend the generality of a thing, and not till after the foresight of somewhat else intend the specialty thereof. I will not tell you how undecent a course Schoolmen conceive it to bee, to attribute decrees to God of things indefinite; I never found any *Arminian* take such a course. Philosophy hath taught us, *duplicem ordinem naturæ*, a double order of nature; as namely, *naturæ generantis, & naturæ intendentis*, in ge-

neration and intention. And albeit, *ſecundùm naturam generationem, communia & generalia*, are *priora ſpecialibus*, in generation, things common and generall are before their ſpeciall: According as a man in generation, *prius vivit vitam plantæ*, firſt lives the life of a plant, then *vitam animalis*, the life of an Animal. Laſtly, *vitam hominis*, the life of a man; yet *quoad naturam intendentem*, as touching the intention the order is quite contrary, & that the more ſpecialls (as more perfect) are firſt in intention. And whereas *intentio rerum gerendarum*, the intention of things to be done, is for the production of things in exiſtence; and it is well known that generals cannot exiſt but in ſpecials, nor ſpecials exiſt but in particulars; it is very ſtrange that God ſhould firſt intend to produce a *Genius*, and after intend the ſpecialty: ſeeing nothing can bee produced but in particular. You may as well ſay that God did firſt intend that Chriſt ſhould die, but whether a natural or violent death that was at firſt undetermined. Secondly, that God determined hee ſhould die a violent death, but whether by a judiciall proceeding, or extrajudiciall, that as yet was left undetermined. And ſee whether this might not bee extended further alſo. But let us examine it by your owne rules, the beſt courſe to preſent before your eyes the ſtrangeneſſe of theſe conceptions. Three things are to bee conſidered as ordered by you one after another. Firſt, Gods abſolute decree to deliver Chriſt to death. Secondly, the foreſight of mens corrupt diſpoſitions. Thirdly, Gods decree to deliver Chriſt to death by the ſins of men.

Now mens ſinfull diſpoſitions depending partly upon originall ſin derived unto all from the ſinne of *Adam*; partly upon mens former actuall converſations; as alſo upon Gods permiſſion of it to continue uncured and uncorrected; it followeth herehence, that the foreſight of theſe ſinfull diſpoſitions did preſupoſe both that God purpoſed to permit *Adams* fall, as alſo to bring theſe men forth into the world in originall ſinne, as alſo to permit their former actuall ſins, wherby they arrive to theſe vitious habits; together with his purpoſe to deny grace whereby theſe vitious habits ſhould bee corrected.

Before all theſe decrees, was the decree of delivering Chriſt to death by certain ſins of certain men, according to your Opinion in this place. Whence it followeth, that the delivering

of

of Christ to death by the sins of men, being last in intention, must bee first in execution, to wit, before *Adam* was suffered to fall, or they suffered by an evill conversation to arise to so corrupt dispositions, or God denyed them grace to correct such corrupt dispositions. And though Christs suffering death in a speciall manner, to wit, by the sins of men, were to bee first in execution, yet Christs suffering death in generall and in an indefinite manner, was to bee last in execution. And this argumentation of mine throughout depends meerly upon your own rules delivered in clearing the first doubt. But passe wee over these scrupulosities.

The course you take to explicate Gods providence in punishing sin with sin, is nothing congruous to the examples thereof set down in holy Scripture. For whereas *Judas* his betraying of Christ was a fruit of his covetousnesse, you make Gods giving him over to the committing of this sin to bee the punishment of his covetousnesse. Likewise whereas the High Priests and Pharisees conspiracy against Christ was a fruite of their envy; (for *Pilate* knew that for envy they had delivered him) and of their ambition, as appeareth *Joh.* 11. 48. you make Gods giving them over to the committing of this sin, to bee the punishment of their ambition and envy. In like sort that *Pilate* gave judgement against Christ being a fruit of his popularity and worldly feare of *Cæsar*, the giving of him over to the committing of this sin, you make to bee the punishment of his popularity and worldly feare of *Cæsar*. So the Jews crying out against him being a fruite of their ignorance and infidelity, the giving them over unto this sin, you make it to bee the punishment of their ignorance and infidelity.

Now shew mee any example throughout the book of God in punishing sin with sin, answerable unto this. As if God did punish mens sinfull dispositions by giving them over to bring forth the proper and congruous fruites of those sinfull dispositions, *Rom.* 1. Wee read God gave the Gentiles over into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient, to commit horrible uncleaneneſſe. But God hereby punished not the unclean disposition, the fruites whereof were brought forth by Gods giving them over into a reprobate minde, but here-

by God punished their Idolatry, 2 *Thess.* 2. 20. Wee read of Gods giving men over to illusions to beleeve lies, hereby hee did not punish their infidelity, the fruite whereof was, the beleeving lies, but hereby hee punished their want of love to Gods truth. So when God sent an evill spirit between *Abimelech* and the men of *Sechem*, to set them together by the eares, hee did not hereby punish their mutuall hatred one against another, but rather their joynt conspiracy against the sons of *Jerubbaal*. I doe not deny but it may bee said, as *Austin* saith, that God hath ordained, *Ut omnis inordinatus animus pœna sit sibi*, That every inordinate minde should bee a punishment to it self; but in my judgement it is a strange liberty of speech, to say, that God doth punish a man for his covetousnesse, by not restraining it, but suffering it to have his course.

What you mean by giving *Judas* over to betray Christ, I know not. Gods providence operative in evill, is of an obscure nature. You speak of obduration and of giving over unto sin, but wherein it consists you explicate not. Yet by declining these phrases, you forsake the point in question: Which is not at this present, whether God gave *Judas* over to the betraying of Christ, but whether hee decreed hee should betray him, and the Priests conspire against him, and the people preferre *Barabbas* before him, and *Pilate* condemn him. Which because you not directly deny, the Question is transferred to the manner of this decree: as namely, whether it bee absolute or conditionall. You will have it to bee conditionall, to wit, upon the presupposall of *Judas* his covetousnesse. Yet this you doe not in plain terms expresse, as indeed you seldome set down your meaning plainly, giving your self too much liberty in speaking at large, which is no way conducing to the investigation of truth, but a fore impediment rather. Having said that it is without warrant to say, that the sinfull manner of Christs death was decreed by God by an unconditionall decree, presupposing no condition in the creatures, which were the wicked instruments of his death. Whereas hereupon you should shew upon presupposall of what condition in *Judas*, in the Priests, in *Pilate*, God decreed that *Judas* should betray him, the Priests deliver him to *Pilate*, and *Pilate* condemn him: you decline this, and in a new phrase tell

us,

us, that it was the punishment of *Judas* his covetousnesse and hypocrisie, that God gave him up to betray Christ; and in like manner you speak of the rest. Leaving to your Reader to expiscate your direct meaning, and to explicate that which you involve. It seems your meaning is, that upon the foresight of *Judas* his covetousnesse and hypocrisie, God decreed hee should betray him.

Now let us discusse this; If God did in this manner decree it, then certainly upon the covetousnesse of *Judas* hee brought this to passe. Now I demand by what course of providence God brought it to passe, that *Judas* betrayed him? you say it was by giving him over to betray him. Now what you mean by this I know not, neither doe you expresse: but I will indevour to explain it.

First, I presume your meaning is God did not restrain his covetousnesse, for this seems to bee the meaning of this phrase, *Psal.* 81. where it is said, *God gave them over to their own hearts lusts*, and by way of explication it is added, *And let them follow their own inventions.* Now this course of providence was not sufficient to bring it to passe, that *Judas* should betray him. For this is onely to let him doe what hee will in the course of his covetousnesse. Now though *Judas* was left to doe what hee would in the way of satisfying his covetous course, yet it doth not follow hereupon that *Judas* should betray Christ. Therefore *Arminius* to this decree of God, presupposeth not *Judas* his covetousnesse onely, but his will to betray Christ, as much as to say, God foreseeing hee would betray him, decreed hee should betray him. To this construction of Gods decree you come too neere, though you doe not deliver your self thereof so plainly as hee doth, nor so plausibly. But the mischief is, it is now confessed on all hands, that the very act of willing is wrought by God, and consequently was decreed by God. Now upon what condition presupposed did God decree that *Judas* should will the betraying of Christ? was it upon the foresight of his will? If so, then also upon the presupposition of *Judas* his will to doe this, God did work his will to do this; which is flat contradiction, in making *Judas* his will to doe this, to goe before his will to doe this. Besides, what need was there for God to work his will to doe this, when his will to

doe this is already presupposed? *Bellarmine* goes another way to work, and confessing that God decreed that Christ should bee betrayed and crucifyed, yet denies that hee decreed that any should betray and crucifie him. Christs suffering was decreed and his patience therein, but not their sin in putting him upon suffering. Your interpretation is lesse plain then theirs, but equally with theirs removed from the truth. Punishment of sin alway presupposeth (I confesse) sin; but I deny that the decree of punishing sin presupposeth sin. If this argument were right; then it would follow, that because to reward with everlasting life, presupposeth good works, Gods decree to reward with everlasting life, presupposeth good works; which is as much to say that election presupposeth good works. For election is the decree of bestowing everlasting life by way of reward; yet here you bring it Gods punishing sin with sin, whereof there is no question here, and forbeare to speak of Gods decree, whereof alone is the present question. I pray you what rewards doth God dispense unto Reprobates in regard of their obedience? will you deny plain Text of Scripture expressely professing, *That wee must all appeare afore the judgement seat of Christ, that every man may receive the things which are done in his body, according to that hee hath done, whether it bee good or evill*? Onely here is the difference, Christ made satisfaction for Gods Elect, and not of Reprobates. And also merited that God should inable his Elect, and not Reprobates to perform obedience acceptable to God, according to the Covenant of Grace, and that Salvation accordingly shall bee bestowed upon them by way of reward.

Yet I confesse Gods equity and justice in dispensing rewards and punishments is no way prejudiced by the absoluteness of his decree. For hee hath absolutely decreed to deale with men according to that, which they have done in their bodies whether it bee good or evill; though the good which is done is meerely of Gods grace, and his rewarding men accordingly, is no impediment to the course of his Covenant of Grace.

Gods calling of Reprobates wee conceive consists in causing the Gospel to bee Preached unto them, which in effect is this, Whosoever beleeves shall bee saved, whosoever beleeves not shall

bee

bee damned; judge you whether there bee not as much truth in Preaching this to Reprobates, as in Preaching it to the very Elect of God.

The Seventh Doubt.

Question, 7.

THat if all bee translated into Christs Dominion, then the Infants of Turks.

First, how then saith the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

Secondly, on all children dying before the guilt of actuall sin, hee will shew the riches of his grace, because their damnation cannot stand, with such an equity of his justice as here is mentioned and made shew of.

Answer. To this I answer, that when I say, that *all the creatures are translated into the Dominion of Christ*, I meane not into his Kingdome of a grace, but into the dominion of his power; *viz.* to be disposed of by him, the wicked to the praise of his justice, and both them and other creatures to the service and exercise of his elect. Hence I conceive it to bee that it is said, that Christ hath bought the dominion of such as deny him. Hence by his dying and rising againe he is said to be *the Lord both of the quick and dead.* Hence God is said *to have given all things into his hand, with all power both in heaven and earth.* Neither am I able to conceive how the whole body of the Creature, I mean all the world beside Reprobates, can be said to waite for the redemption, and restoring into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, unlesse as they lost their liberty—— by the first *Adam*, so they had recovered the same again by the redemption of the second *Adam.* If then all the creatures be translated into the dominion of Christ, thinke it not absurd that the Infants of Turks themselves be translated into the same dominion. The place that may be alledged to the contrary, doth prove the Infants of Infidels not to bee translated into the Kingdom of grace, or fellowship of his Church, but what is that to this point touching children that die in their infancy before the guilt of their actuall sin? I would not hastily determine any thing.

Col. 1. 3.

Rom. 14. 9.
John 3. 35.
Mat. 28. 18.
Phil 1. 8, 9, 10, 11.

thing. *Præstat dubitare de occultis, quàm litigare de incertis.* It is better to doubt of secret things, then wrangle about things uncertaine. They ſtand or fall to him, who hath ſaid of the Infants of ſuch parents, as commend them to the bleſſing of Mark 10. 14. Chriſt, *Of ſuch is the kingdome of God.* But to my underſtanding it is moſt agreeable to the analogy of faith to range little children under the covenant of Parents, it being Gods uſuall manner of dealing, to viſit the ſins of the Fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him, and to ſhew mercy unto thouſands of them that love him, and keep his commandements.

Exam. That all creatures are under the dominion of Chriſt no Chriſtian doubteth, for as God, hee made all things, *Col.* 1. *John* 1. and as the ſon of God, he is the heire of all things, *Heb.* 1. *When God bringeth in his firſt begotten ſonne into the world, he ſaith of him, Let all the Angels of God worſhip him,* Heb. 1. 6. & Joh. 5. *God hath committed all judgement unto his Son,* and Joh. 17. 2. *Thou haſt given him power over all fleſh.* But that hee hath bought this dominion, well it may paſſe for an Oracle of fleſh and blood, but I have not hitherto found it to bee an Oracle of God. Whatſoever is bought, is bought with a price. And ſo whatſoever Chriſt hath bought, hee hath bought with a price, 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. & 7. 23. And this price wherewith Chriſt hath bought that which hee hath bought, is his blood, *Rev.* 5. 9. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. But blood is no fit price wherewith to buy Dominion. His blood is propitiatory and ſatisfactory, and ſo fit onely to buy poore ſoules, and to ſave them from condemnation. And accordingly, the life that hee gave for many, was given by the way of ranſome, *Matth.* 20. 24. So that perſons thereby are ranſomed, rather then any generall dominion procured. And is it fit to ſay, that Chriſt by his blood obtained dominion over the wicked to damn them for their ſins? Rather the power which hee obtained was to give eternall life to them, whom his Father had given him, *Joh.* 17. 2. and that in deſpite of ſin.

Againe, is it fit to ſay that Chriſt by his blood bought dominion over brute and ſenſeleſſe creatures? Or, that by his blood hee obtained dominion over Angels and Devils? Whom Chriſt bought, hee bought unto God, *Rev.* 5. 9. And ſhall wee

ſay

ſay that by his death hee bought unto God the dominion over Reprobates, whether Men or Angels, and over all other creatures?

Again, whom hee bought, hee bought from the earth, *Rev.* 14. 8. And from men, *ver.* 4. Can this bee verifyed of Angels of light, and of angels of darkneſſe, and of reprobate men, and of all Gods creatures?

Laſtly, whom hee bought by his blood, hee redeemed from their vain converſation, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. So hee did not redeem either reprobate men, or reprobate angels; and as for the Elect Angels they ſtood not in need of any ſuch Redemption, much leſſe the brute creatures of God. Yet even of ſome that were no better then Reprobates, it is ſaid that hee redeemed them, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. And hence *Arminius* inferres that the moſt wicked are redeemed by Chriſt, and that in the ſame ſenſe that Gods Elect are redeemed by Chriſt. You ſay hee redeemed, even the Reprobates, but not in the ſame manner as hee redeemed the Elect, but onely that hee bought the dominion of them. But this ſeems a forced interpretation: For whom hee hath bought, they are his in ſpeciall manner. But to bee Chriſts, is peculiar to Gods Elect, 2 *Cor.* 3. *ult.* And hence the Apoſtle inferreth, *Glorifie God in your bodies*, 1 *Cor.* 6. *ult.* You will ſay, In what ſenſe doth the Apoſtle ſay of wicked men, that the Lord redeemed them?

I anſwer, it may bee ſaid in the ſame ſenſe wherein it is ſaid of the gods of *Damaſcus* that they plagued *Ahaz*: not that indeed they plagued him, or had any power to plague him, for *An Idol is nothing*, ſaith *Paul*, that is, hath no power to doe good or evill, but it was *Ahaz* his opinion that they plagued him, and ſo hee ſacrificed unto them.

Again, their former profeſſion was ſuch, that they were the redeemed of the Lord as well as any other. So *Piſcator* interpreteth that place in *Peter*, as ſpoken, not κατ' ἀληθειαν, but κατ' δόξαν, not as it were ſo indeed, but in their opinion onely, or in the common opinion of others. The creature likewiſe ſhall bee reſtored by him, *Act.* 3. *For the Heavens muſt contain him, till the time come that God hath appointed, for the reſtoring of all things.* But that redemption is not yet, neither hath hee purchaſed that redemption with his blood.

Wee deny not that all creatures are under the dominion of Christ, but that they should bee translated into his dominion by way of purchase by his blood, that seemes to mee a strange conceit. Yet it sufficeth us that you confesse, that Turks, together with their Infants, are not translated into the kingdome of Grace. By Infants of Turks wee understand none other then such as dye in their Infancy, and I wonder, you should distinguish betwixt them; Why you should reckon the condition of Infants deceasing out of the Church, amongst the number of *the secret things of the Lord*, I see no reason. Are they not born children of wrath? And if they continue so from the time of their conception unto their birth, why not as well from the time of their birth, to the time of their death dying in their Infancy? And can wee doubt what is the condition of those who dye children of wrath? doth not God say of the Sodomites, that *they suffer the vengeance of eternall fire*, and were there (think you) no Infants at all amongst them? As for those who are commended to the blessing of Christ, I make no question but that of such is the Kingdom of God. For the Apostle teacheth us, that if but one parent bee a beleever, the children are holy, but if neither are, they are unclean.

But if they die in their uncleanenesse, unwashed, unsanctifyed, what shall become of them?

You doe well in mine opinion, to range little children under the covenant of their Parents: that I like well; but I like not so well the reason whereby you inforce it. For the sins of the Father who is under one Covenant may bee visited upon their children unto the third and fourth generation who are under another covenant. For the sins committed in the dayes of *Manasses*, were in the captivity of *Babylon*, visited upon the children in a fourth generation after, and that upon as gracious children as were those that were represented by the basket of good figges, *Jer.* 24. And the Covenant between *Jonathan* and *David*, was only the preservative for keeping gracious *Mephibosheth*, from having visited upon him the sins of his Grandfather *Saul*, in slaying the *Gibeonites*. Neither yet have wee cause to complain as the heathen doth *Delicta majorum immeritis ulcisci Romane*. For if I mistake not, there is a great deale of difference between punishing the Son for the sin of the Father,

(which

(which hath no place at all in Gods providence, excepting the case of punishing originall sin, if so it hath place in that) and visiting the sin of the Father upon the Son. This being the punishment of the Father rather then of the Son; And God being able to sanctifie any temporall affliction that falleth upon the son for the sin of his Father, either while the Father liveth or after, and to make it fall amongst the number of those things which work together for his good.

The Eighth and last Doubt.

Question 8.

HOw may it appeare, that this makes not three Covenants? The first of works, requiring perfect obedience.

The second of grace, promising Christ and all his graces, even faith in him.

The third, partly of grace, providing a redemption, and promising sufficient help; partly as requiring both what wee can doe of our selves, and Gods help proceeding with us accordingly.

Answer. This frame of Doctrine is so farre from making three Covenants, that the serious meditation of two Covenants was one of the principall reasons that first turned the stream of my thoughts into this current. For when I saw that the Covenant of works did in justice reward according to works, as well with life upon condition of obedience, as with death in case of disobedience; I began to conceive, that as the purpose of election was futable to the Covenant of grace; so futable unto a Covenant of works, must bee a purpose of retribution. For how shall God covenant to retribute or recompence with life or death according to works, if hee have no purpose at all of such retribution? How shall the Covenant of works promise life upon condition of obedience, if the purpose of reprobation have absolutely determined death upon all them within that Covenant, without all respect of good or evill, obedience or disobedience in any of them? the grace of redemption offering the death of Christ, and reaching forth some

The Examination must proceed according to this correction.

fruites thereof unto all, as the promising and offering sufficient help to bring them to the knowledge of God and means of grace: yea, and sometime bestowing on them the participation of some excellent and common graces, doth not make a third covenant, partly of grace, partly of works, but bindeth such so much the more to keep the Covenants of works, by how much the more helps and means God vouchsafeth them to keep it. It is not the helps of grace offered or given, that includeth men within any part of the Covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon it is offered or given.

Secondly, if God offer grace and give, though never so small, even as a grain of Mustard-seed, and promise to uphold it freely for Christ his sake, and not according to our works, it is a Covenant of Grace. But if hee offer and give never so many gracious helps, and means, and gifts, and uphold them according to the works of the creature; it is still a Covenant of works, as it was to the Angels that fell, and to *Adam*, though hee gave to both of them the whole Image of God, and besides, heaven it self to the one, a Paradise to the other, it is but the same covenant of works which God made with the world of mankinde after the fall, and with *Adam* before the fall: though *Adam* received greater means and helps to keep it, then his posterity had after the fall.

Because still the condition of the Covenant was the same in both, to reward them both according to their works. So is it still but the same Covenant of works which God makes with mankinde, when hee offereth them in Christ, greater grace and helps to keep it, then after the fall they could have attained unto without Christ, because still the condition of the Covenant runneth in the same tenour, to deal with them according to their works.

Neither doe I conceive any danger in the point, though by this means obedience to Christ, and walking worthy of him, should bee commanded in the Law, which is a covenant of works. For if the infidelity and disobedience of the men of this world to the Gospel of Christ bee sin, then are they also transgressors of the Law, and then the contrary vertues are commanded in the Law.

Thirdly, the Ceremonies of the Old Testament, which were figures

figures of Christ, were commanded in the second precept of the Law, was not Christ himself under those figures commanded also? were they commanded to lay their hands on the sacrifices, and not withall to lay their Faith on Christ? were they commanded to look on the Brazen Serpent, and not withall to behold Christ? were they commanded to obey *Moses*, and not withall the Prophet like unto *Moses*? What then? doe wee confound the Law and the Gospel? God forbid; The Law indeed commandeth to obey God in whatsoever hee had of old, or in fulnesse of time, should afterwards reveale to bee his will: but it is one thing to command Christ to bee obeyed and revealed, (which after Christ is revealed, even the Law also doth to all that heare it) another thing it is to give Christ freely, and faith to receive him, and the spirit likewise to obey him, yea and perseverance also notwithstanding our unworthinesse to continue in him, all which the Gospel promiseth to the Elect of God.

Glory bee to God in Christ, and peace upon Israel.

Exam. If the serious consideration of two covenants did turn the stream of your thoughts into this * *covenant*, it should seem you doe acknowledge a third covenant, distinct from the former two. Therefore I conceive there is an errour in the writing, and that whereunto the stream of your thoughts was turned, is not a different covenant from the former two, but rather an opinion concerning reprobation, different from that which is most generally received amongst our Divines. And albeit hereupon you fell on this; yet herehence it followeth not, but that you might hereby fall upon laying a ground for three covenants ere you are aware. Yet do I not charge you with this. As in some respect you may seem to make three; so in another respect you may seem to make but one; if the covenant of retribution according unto works bee but one; For I see no reason but Gods purpose of election, may well passe for a purpose of retribution; and consequently, if the purpose of election and reprobation bee reduced unto one, why may not the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, by your rules bee reduced into one? As election is Gods purpose to bestow everlasting life, seeing God doth not purpose to bestow it, but by way of

* Indeed it should bee not *Covenant*, as my Copy had it, but *current*, as a friend shewed mee how to correct it.

reward of obedience, of faith and repentance, and good works; it necessarily followeth that Gods election is his purpose of retribution. But there is besides in election, a purpose to work a certain number of men unto faith, obedience, and good works, and unto a finall perseverance in them all. So likewise between the covenant of the Law and the covenant of Grace, there is this principall difference: that God inables his elect to the performance of the one, not of the other; but as touching the reprobate, hee inableth them to the performance of neither condition. Subservient to Gods election of some is each covenant. The covenant of works to humble them, not onely upon the consideration of their sins, whereby they have merited eternall death; but especially upon consideration how their naturall corruption is so farre from being mastered and corrected by the Law, as that on the contrary it is irritated and exasperated so much the more. Then the covenant of grace to comfort them, considering how the condition of life is adulced and tempered, being from exact and strict obedience changed into faith and repentance; but chiefely upon consideration that the word of this covenant is a word of power mastering their corruption, and inabling to perform faith, repentance, and Evangelicall obedience in an acceptable manner unto the Lord. Subservient to the purpose of reprobation may bee the Law, only writen in mens hearts, which very obscurely, intimateth (if at all) any covenant made of everlasting life between God and man. Where the word is revealed, that in generall comprehending both Law and Gospel, is subservient thereunto in the way of instruction and exhortation, and the like, thereby taking away all excuse.

Of any other end intended towards them I know not, except sometimes, as *Austin* observeth, *Vt proficiant ad exteriorem vitæ emendationem quo mitius puniantur.* And why I pray may not the covenant of workes promise life upon condition of obedience, notwithstanding the purpose of reprobation hath absolutely determined death, upon all them within the Covenant: as well as the Covenant of grace threatens death upon condition of disobedience of faith and repentance: notwithstanding that the purpose of election hath absolutely determined life upon all them within that Covenant. And yet like

as

as in election wee acknowledge a respect to obedience, consequent thereunto, in as much as it includes a purpose to give grace to work them to obedience, though not any respect therto, as antecedent to the decree it self; how much more may you easily conceive, that in reprobation wee deny not a respect to disobedience consequent, for as much as it includes a purpose to deny grace, which alone can prevent disobedience, though not any respect to disobedience as antecedent to the decree of reprobation? And to repeate by the way, that which formerly hath been delivered.

Respect to disobedience as antecedent to the decree of damnation cannot bee imagined, unlesse withall you imagine God did first decree to permit it, and thereupon for the foresight thereof decree to damne for it: Whence it followeth that permission of disobedience must bee first in intention, in comparison with condemnation, and consequently it must bee last in execution by your own rules, formerly laid down as unquestionable foundations. Yet doe not I maintain that God in any moment of nature, doth first decree damnation, and then decree the permission of sin, for which hee damnes them; I make these decrees not subordinate as most doe, but co-ordinate and joynt decrees, being onely concerning meanes tending to the same end. And with *Aquinas*, I say that reprobation includes *Voluntatem permittendi culpam, & condemnationem inferendi pro culpa*. The end whereof is the demonstration of his glory in the way of justice. But withall I desire that *culpa* in this description of reprobation may bee understood aright, and not as *Arminius* doth, whose superficiall consideration of things is usually for his advantage, making him thereby the more to abound in arguments for the impugning of his adversaries opinions, according to his own shaping of them quite beside their meaning. For *culpa* is not sin in generall in this definition, but onely such a sin, *propter quod quis damnatur*, for which a man is damned; that is, finall perseverance in infidelity or impenitency. When you say the grace of redemption offers the death of Christ, and reacheth forth some fruite thereof unto all, you walk according to your course in the clouds of your own mystries.

What you mean by these fruites you speak of, and by the reach-

reaching of them forth, I am utterly to ſeek; neither doth ought you have formerly delivered helpe mee in this. But in theſe particulars it ſeems you love to ſpeak darkly; and keep your ſelf to generall terms. I know no condition propoſed in the Goſpel, for receiving of any benefit from Chriſt, but faith and repentance. But you ſeem to bring in gracious helps for the obtaining of faith and repentance, to bee tendred unto us for Chriſts ſake upon other conditions, I know not what; neither have I hitherto received any ground of aſſurance from this your diſcourſe, that your ſelf know what. In the next place you ſeem to ſpecifie what theſe fruites are, as when you ſay, that it promiſeth and offereth ſufficient helpe to bring them to the knowledge of God, and means of grace, ſtill keeping your ſelf in the generall, as if you feared to bee underſtood. And I wonder not a little that your ſelf being a man of ſuch reputation, and much exerciſed in giving ſatisfaction, addreſſing your ſelf to give ſatisfactivn in ſo tender and precious points of Divinity as theſe, ſhould deliver your ſelf in ſo ſtrange a language. But let us take the more paines in diſcuſſing the clouds of your Phraſiologies. When you ſay the grace of redemption promiſeth and offereth ſufficient helps; your meaning muſt bee that the Goſpel of Chriſt doth promiſe and offer this, for as much as wee are acquainted with no promiſes of Grace but in the Goſpel. Yet this phraſe of expreſſing, uſed by you, is enough to trouble a Reader, who when the matter wee treat of is difficult enough, might juſtly deſire that hee might not bee put to other trouble, as to interpret mens expreſſions. Yet it may bee you may think to have a ground for this out of Saint *Paul*, where hee ſaith, *The grace of God which bringeth ſalvation hath appeared unto all, teaching us to deny ungodlineſſe*; and by which grace hee ſeemes to meane the Goſpel. Bee it ſo, yet Saint *Paul* doth not call it the grace of redemption, as you doe. Redemption in Scripture phraſe ſignifies forgiveneſſe of ſins, *Epheſ.* 1.7. and *Col.* 1.14. If this bee your meaning, I finde no congruity in this your affirmation. For what? will you ſay the Goſpel preached, doth promiſe and offer to bring men to the knowledge of God, and means of grace? I had thought rather it had brought the knowledge of God and meanes of grace to them. Or rather is the very

bring-

bringing of it, or to ſpeak more properly is the very means of grace it ſelf. All which conſidered, I am yet to ſeek of your meaning, I finde it ſo miſerably involved, and that in the very cloſe of all, enough to make any intelligent Reader deſpaire to receive ſatisfaction from you, when in the very laſt act hee ſhall finde himſelfe ſo farre from making any tolerable conſtruction of your words, thereby to pick out any ſober meaning.

Then againe, by offering helps, you ſeem to imply ſome termes or condition whereupon it is offered them, but no ſuch condition is expreſſed by you. If it had, perhaps thereby wee might have taken the altitude. I mean the depth of your meaning throughout. The ſame grace of redemption beſtows alſo (you ſay) ſometimes ſome excellent though common graces. I have heard (I confeſſe) you ſtand much upon common graces. But what they are, and to what end they tend, and whether abſolutely or conditionally imparted according to your opinion: when I ſhall bee ſufficiently informed, I will doe my beſt indevour to weigh them in the ballance of Chriſtian and Scholaſticall examination, and accordingly to give them that due reſpect which belongs unto them. It may bee about a third covenant, which they might ſeem to make, partly of grace and partly of works: I ſhould not bee much contentious. Yet it followeth not, that becauſe they doe binde the more to the keeping of the Covenant of works, as having more means and helps vouchſafed unto them; therefore it doth not make a third Covenant: You ſay it is not the helps of grace offered or given, that include men within any part of the covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon it is offered or given: that is, whereupon they are offered or given, to wit, the helps of grace.

Here new myſteries offer themſelves againe, I muſt bee driven *Balaam*-like to caſt about for divinations: and whether in the iſſue I ſhall finde that I ſeek for, I cannot aſſure my ſelf. You came but now from ſpeaking of common graces, and by the coherence, theſe helps of grace which here you ſpeak of, ſhould bee thoſe common graces, conſidered as helps of grace ſpeciall. Now had you given inſtance, and ſhewed what theſe common graces are, they might of themſelves have diſcovered

the reference wherein they ſtand unto grace ſpeciall, which I gheſſe to bee faith and repentance. This you might eaſily have done, and ſaved us a great deale of irreſolution and paines alſo, partly in ſeeking after that which wee cannot eaſily finde, and partly in labouring to diſprove wee know not what. This confuſed courſe proceeds in ſome from an ill minde, fearing leſt their oppoſites ſhould have too much liberty by their plaine dealing to impugne them, but in good men it proceeds from the weakneſſe of their cauſe, and from the uncertainty and ambiguity of their thoughts, for the juſtifying of that which they doe maintain. But let us proceed. Theſe helps of grace by which I hope you mean, helps unto faith and repentance, you plainly ſignifie are offered upon a condition, and by the quality of this condition wee may judge whether they to whom they are offered are included within the covenant of grace or no.

Now let us indevour to ſound your meaning; Theſe helps of grace muſt needs bee, either outward means, or inward qualities and habits.

By helps I ſhould underſtand outward means, after mine own phraſe of ſpeech, and by yours alſo I have good cauſe; for as much as in the words immediately going before, you joyn helps and means together, and confound common graces with them both. As for means of grace, they are not given upon condition; for what condition can bee imagined whereupon the Goſpel ſhould bee given to a Nation? ſhall it bee the uſing of their naturalls right? how will you bee able to make it good, that heathen men before they injoyed the Goſpel, did uſe their naturalls right? Did the *Corinthians* who were carryed away with dumb Idols even as they were led? 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. And for not honouring God as God, did not God give them up into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient as well as others, thereby to receive the recompence of their errours? Judge of this by that which the Apoſtle mindes them of, 1 *Cor.* 6. For after hee had told them that neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor Wantons, nor Buggerers, nor Theeves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Raylers, nor Extortioners, ſhall inherit the Kingdome of God, *ver.* 9. 10. forthwith hee addeth, καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, theſe

theſe things were ſome of you, as much as to ſay, ſome of you were fornicators, ſome adulterers, ſome Idolaters, ſome wantons, ſome buggerers, ſome theeves, ſome covetous, ſome drunkards, ſome raylers, ſome extortioners; or ſome of them in diverſe kindes, if not in all theſe kindes lyable to condemnation, and utter excluſion out of the Kingdom of God: *But* (yet for all this) *yee are waſhed, but yee are ſanctifyed, but yee are juſtified, in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the ſpirit of our God*, *ver.* 11. And is it not manifeſt that when the Goſpel is firſt preached to any Nation, it is preached as well to the uncivill as to thoſe that are civill: as well to the debauched as to the morall?

Again, In this caſe, the Goſpel ſhould bee beſtowed by way of reward of obedience: but obedience is no obedience, unleſſe it bee performed upon knowledge, in obedience unto ſome Law given. Now how could the Gentiles know of any ſuch Law, that whoſoever uſed their naturalls ſhould bee rewarded with the benefit of the Goſpel; ſeeing this is no where pretended to bee revealed but in the Goſpel? So that aſſoon as any man hears of ſuch a Law, hee already enjoyeth the Goſpel. The two firſt of theſe arguments may as well bee applyed againſt this doctrine of yours, if by helps of Grace you mean ſome habits or qualities beſides that which may bee further alledged upon your ſpecification, what theſe habits and qualities are.

And here is a faire way opened for a third Covenant; for as for the two covenants commonly acknowledged, they are onely for the obtaining of Salvation different wayes: beſides which here is brought in another Covenant for the obtaining the means of grace, and that different wayes alſo, to wit, either by works or by Grace. But when I look unto your former words and conſider them well, as when you ſay it is not the helps of grace offered or given, that include men within any part of the Covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon it is offered or given, theſe words, It is offered or given, perhaps are not referred to the helps of grace, but rather to the grace it ſelf, yet I interpret them of the helps of grace, with no other minde then to ſalve this rule of yours from manifeſt contradiction.

For by your rule you profeſſe, that the incluſion of ſome within the covenant of grace, and the excluſion of others, depends not upon any indifference in the things offered or given, but onely on the condition whereupon they are offered or given; manifeſtly implying thereby, that the ſame things are given to them that are without the covenant, and to them that are within; but the difference is onely in the condition whereupon they are given.

But if your rule run thus, it is not the helps offered or given, that include a man within the Covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon the grace it ſelf is given. Hereby you manifeſt that they within the Covenant of grace, and they without are diſtinguiſhed, not onely by the condition, whereupon that which they have is given, but alſo by the things themſelves which are given them: for as much as onely the helps of grace are given to the one, to wit, to them that are without the covenant, but not only helps of grace, but grace it ſelf is given to the other, which ſerves directly contrary to your rule here given: not to ſpeak of the miſerable confuſion that like a Leproſie ſeizeth upon your manner of expreſſion, and which you hold up in the beginning of your next ſection. But before I come to the ſcanning thereof, let mee tell you of your diſ-junctive phraſe, as when you ſaid, *offered or given*; this is very ill-accommodated to the helps of grace, if you meane helpes outward, ſuch as the Goſpel; for the Goſpel where it is preached, there it is not onely offered, but *hoc ipſo* given.

The phraſe *offered*, is as ill accommodated to grace it ſelf in reſpect of the condition, whereupon depends admiſſion into the convenant of grace. For to offer to a man admiſſion into the covenant of grace upon condition, is to offer it upon a condition to bee performed by him to whom it is offered. But ſuch an offering your ſelf confeſſe doth ſavour of a covenant of works, but when the condition is meerly for Chriſts ſake, that you ſay makes the covenant of grace. Now to that which followeth.

If God offer (ſay you) and give it, to wit, [grace] though never ſo ſmall, even as a grain of muſtard ſeed, and promiſeth to uphold it freely for Chriſts ſake, and not according to our

works,

works, it is a covenant of grace. But if hee offer and give never so many helps, and means, and gifts, and uphold them according to the works of the creature, it is still a covenant of workes, as it was to the Angels that fell, and to *Adam*. Here you continue your former confusion; for pretending to maintain the difference between them within, and them without the covenant of grace, as depending meerely upon the condition, whereupon things are given; you notwithstanding this, make a difference also in the things given. For the one thing, given to them within the covenant of grace, you seem to make grace it self, though perhaps as small as a grain of mustard seed, and not onely helpes of grace; but the things given to them without the Covenant, are onely gracious helps and means. And withall you deale not fairely in the expression of that which you intend; for you do not make it plainly appeare, that you put a difference between the things given (lest you should contradict your self, for you place the difference onely in the condition whereupon the thing given, is given) but that which is given to them within the covenant of grace you formerly expressed by the relative [*it*], which made mee in doubt whether I should referre it to grace it self; or to the helps of grace; yet forthwith on the other side running again to helps, you doe not style them helps of grace, as before you did, which doth manifestly distinguish helps of grace, from grace it self, but you call them gratious helps and means, and not contented with that, you adde *gifts* also, as if your purpose were not to distinguish them from grace in the other member of the comparison mentioned, but rather to confound them therewith. Which I confesse sorts best with your rule, which placeth the difference only in the condition of the things given, and not in the things given themselves. And this is further confirmed by the instance given in Angels and *Adam*, where you plainly give us to understand, that by gracious helps and means, and gifts given them, you understand the Image of God; which clearly signifies not any outward help and means, (after which manner I was prone to interpret this phrase of yours) but the very inward sanctification of their natures, which in my judgement is very untowardly called means of grace, or helps of grace.

Whereas it is rather, that holy power wherewith God had indued them to perform that which hee had commanded them. For of *Adam*, that is undoubtedly true which *Austin* saith, namely, that God gave *Adam, posse si voluit; non dedit velle quod potuit*, power to obey if hee would, but not a will to doe that which hee could; and questionlesse it is as true of the Angels as of *Adam*.

And this power I confesse had continued in them, had they performed actuall obedience according to that power, whereof by their disobedience they were deprived. Whereby you give mee good ground to guesse, what that opinion of yours is, (which you carry wondrous closely, (and I verily beleeve because of the offensive nature thereof to good men, such as your self) namely, That power to beleeve and repent is given to them as well without the covenant, as to them within; like as both Angels and *Adam* before their fall, had power to perform obedience to Gods Commands: But to them within the covenant of grace, it is given and upheld onely for Christs sake; to others it is to bee given and upheld onely according to the covenant of works, that is, upon condition of some performance of theirs. But yet of the full pourtraiture of your opinion, I am to seek in some particulars; As

First, what the condition is upon the performance whereof they shall have power given them to beleeve and repent. Whatsoever you say, or give instance in, if it bee a work of nature, it will necessarily follow that grace shall bee possibly, at least resolved into a work of nature; then wee are where wee are, and still to seek how they came by power to perform that work of grace.

Secondly, I am to seek by what means God doth work this power, whether onely by perswasion, which is onely a morall action, or by an immediate change of their natures by the inspiration of Gods Spirit.

Now the first of these cannot bee; for perswasion hath no power to change the nature of ought, and work new powers in it, which are not wrought without giving a new life. And indeed perswasion tends rather to move men to doe that which they have power to doe, then from thence to receive a power of doing. Wee doe not perswade men, *ut possint aliquid facere,*

sed

sed ut velint, & ut faciant, to bee able to do ought, but to move them to bee willing to doe it.

If by immediate inspiration giving a new life, then it follows that regeneration is a common grace, possible at least, given to them as well without the Covenant of grace, as to them within: to the Reprobates as well as to the Elect, and that upon performance of a work of nature. And because it were in vain to speak of upholding it after it is given, unlesse it were given indeed, you imply hereby that even this power is given to Reprobates. But whereas it is to bee upholden but upon condition, yet you doe not expresse what this condition is. But I guesse the condition hereof is the exercising of this power; like as upon the exercising of the power which God gave Angels and *Adam*, before the fall, they had been confirmed in their integrity. But what if they do not beleeve or repent for a year or two together; yet I presume you will not say they are thereupon deprived of this power, but that it continueth for ought wee know to the contrary to their lives end; though it fell out quite contrarily with Angels and *Adam*, who immediately upon their disobedience were deprived of this power. What is your meaning when you say, God offers mankinde in Christ, greater grace and helps to keep the Covenant of works, then after the fall they could have attained to without Christ, I cannot easily comprehend, and throughout finde you very close and reserved hereupon, which to speak like a free man, is no good dealing.

First, I know not what that grace and help is, which here you speak of. If your meaning bee no more but this, that they have more power to perform the Covenant of works through Christ, then otherwise; (as I guesse it will come to no more in the end) I pray you what think you of mankinde before Christ came into the world, had they this power you speak of through Christ? If you think they had, I pray you how came they by it? If onely it hold of mankinde since the preaching of the Gospel; I demand whether of all, or some? if of all, then you must acknowledge the Gospel to bee preached to all. If only of them to whom it is preached; yet the question still is, whether it bee wrought by perswasion or inspiration.

Secondly, in saying that in Christ they have greater grace

to

to help to keep it, your phraſe doth imply, that even without Chriſt men have grace and helpes and power to keep the Covenant of works. In a word, dare you ſay that any naturall man hath any power to bee ſubject to the Law of God, or to doe that which is pleaſing in Gods ſight? If you ſay they have any ſuch power, I demand whether ever any were found ſubject to the Law of God, or did that which was pleaſing in Gods ſight? It is very ſtrange that never any ſuch act ſhould proceed from a power ſo generall. If they were, or did that which was pleaſing in Gods ſight, then they were not in the fleſh, for *they that are in the fleſh cannot pleaſe God.* Rom. 8.

Laſtly, when you ſay, theſe helps or this power is offered them in Chriſt, it implies that upon ſome condition performable on their parts it is offered unto them. Now it were very requiſite you ſhould deale plainly, and expreſſe this condition, which you doe not. I confeſſe I ſee no danger in acknowledging that God purpoſeth to deale with mankinde according to their works; nay I wonder you ſhould exclude the elect from the number of thoſe with whom God deales in this manner; when the Apoſtle profeſſeth ſo directly, wee muſt all appeare before the judgement ſeat of God, that every man may receive the things which are done in his body, according to that hee hath done, whether good or evill, 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. Onely for Chriſts ſake God giveth faith and repentance to ſome, working in them that which is pleaſing in his ſight through Jeſus Chriſt; and doth not deale in the like mercy with others.

The reſt of this Section I diſlike not.

Glory bee to God in Chriſt, and peace upon Iſrael,
In ſubmiſſion unto his Truth.

For why ſhould wee lye for God, as man doth for man, to gratifie him?

FOR

For an Auctarium, here is laid down a short Survey of the ninth Chapter to the *Romans*, so farre as it treateth of the Doctrine of Predestination: the better to clear some passages of the former Discourse.

THe whole Chapter from the first verse to the 23. is taken up in the answering of objections, each latter arising from the answer to the former: for the Apostle having taught in the last verse of the former Chapter, that nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ giveth occasion of this doubt that may arise. *Analysis.*

Quest. What think you of the Jews, are not they the Elect people of God, and yet are not they separate from Christ?

Answ. The Apostle doth not plainly affirm it, that they are separate from Christ, but with much compassion bewailes it, yea, and protesteth, that hee would wish himself rather separate from Christ for their sakes: The grounds of which hee rendreth to bee for his kindreds sake, *ver.* 3. for their priviledges sake, *ver.* 4, 5.

This coherence I could brook well enough, onely I say it is devised at pleasure: and I finde it is a generall course to feign coherences, and sometimes onely to shape thereby some conformation of the Apostles meaning to their interpretation of him. The Apostle I am sure makes none, and accordingly *Ludovicus Leoburgensis* professeth, saying, *Prorsus nova disputatio instituitur, in qua tametsi doctrinam de Justificatione alicubi repetit & intertexit, tamen duas alias materias principales tractat: videlicet, quis sit vere populus Dei, seu quæ sit vera Ecclesia, & de vocatione Gentium. Judæi contendebant, se esse Ecclesiam, se esse populum; ad se solos pertinere promissiones.* Paulus *respondet Electos esse populos Dei.* The disputation here instituted by the Apostle, is altogether new, wherein although hee doth sometimes repeale and insert the Doctrine of Justification; yet hee handles two other *Exam.*

principall matters, to wit, who are the people of God in truth, and which is the true Church, and of the calling of the Gentiles. The Jews contended that they were the Church, they were Gods people, and that to them alone pertained the promises. *Paul* answers that the Elect alone are Gods people.

Analysis. What is then the word (the word of promise of inseparable conjunction with Christ) to them of none effect?

Answ. No, all are not *Israel* which are of *Israel*: nor are all the children of *Abraham*, that are of the seed of *Abraham*, but in *Isaac* are his seed called, *viz.* Not the children of *Abrahams* flesh are the children of God, but the children of promise, *ver.* 6, 7, 8. which hee proveth by a twofold instance, or example.

First, of *Isaac* the seed of *Abraham* by *Sarah*, who was given unto him as his seed by the word of promise, *ver.* 9.

Secondly, of *Jacob* the seed of *Isaac* by *Rebekah*, of whom another promise was given, that the elder brother should bee to him a servant, *ver.* 11.

Which promise touching *Jacob* is amplifyed by 3.

First, the freenesse of it, all cause of different acceptation being removed from the two brethren, and in regard, first, of parentage, *ver.* 10. secondly, of personall condition and indowments, *ver.* 11. which freenesse is also further set forth by the end of it, that the purpose of God might stand firm, as not depending on any condition in the Creature, *ver.* 11.

Secondly, A parallell promise suiting to it, preferring *Jacob* before *Esau* in Gods affection, when they were both considered onely as brethren, *ver.* 13.

Exam. These words of the Apostle are I confesse the key of the whole Chapter, for opening the meaning, or at least making way to a faire understanding of all that follows. If the Jews are reject-

ed

ed as the Apostle presupposeth (to wit, as touching the most of them) in the former words, then it may seem that Gods word is of none effect, which consequence, (the Apostle supposing such a consequence likely to bee made) by his denying of it doth imply, that there was some Word of God that seemed to bee made of none effect by this Doctrine concerning the rejection of the Jews. This word therefore is to bee inquired into, the investigation whereof will give light to all the rest. Now this word can bee no other then the word of some promise made by God for the taking of the seed of *Abraham* to bee his people, to bee his Church. For such a promise alone seems to stand in contradiction unto our Christian Doctrine, concerning the rejection of the Jews. And indeed such a promise God made to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between mee and thee, and thy seed after thee, for an everlasting Covenant, To bee a God to thee and to thy seed after thee.* This I conceive to bee the Word of God, which the Apostle had before his eyes when hee delivered this, and denyed that this word and promise of God can bee of none effect; although it bee granted, that most part of the Jews bee rejected, provided that all are not. And hee gives this reason, to wit, because this word and promise of God concerning *Abrahams* seed to bee taken into his Covenant of Grace, did not comprehend all his seed: for *all are not Israel, that are of Israel, &c.* seeing then wee doe not maintain that all *Israel* are rejected (for as it followeth, *Rom.* 11. 1. *I demand then; Hath God cast away his people? God forbid, For I am also an Israelite. God hath not cast away his people whom hee knew before*, ver. 5. *Even so then at this present there is a remnant according to the Election of grace.* Withall the Apostle signifyeth that not one of Gods people is rejected: to wit, not one of them whom hee did foreknow, which *Rom.* 9. 8. are called children of promise, in opposition to the children of the flesh: alluding to *Isaac*, who was begotten beyond the power of nature, and by vertue of Gods promise made to *Abraham* for a Son, when both hee and *Sarah* were dead as touching any naturall power to beget, or conceive a Childe. But God to make his promise good, inabled them with power hereunto above nature. And conformably hereunto alluding also to the condition of Gods children begotten unto

him, not by power of nature, but above nature, by vertue of a promise likewise, even that which hee made unto *Abraham*, that *in his seed* (that is, in Christ) *all the Nations of the earth should bee blessed*. That is, the Elect of God amongst all Nations. And to make this good by the power of his grace and his holy Spirit, hee begets them unto himself, each in his appointed time according to their generations.

Quest. Is there not then unrighteousnesse with God to deale so unequally with persons equall? *ver.* 14.

Answ. God forbid, which denyall the Apostle proveth by a double testimony of *Moses*, both of them declaring the absolute Soveraignty of God over the creatures, and thereby his liberty to deale diversly or unequally with persons equall.

First, the one by shewing the independency of his mercy, *ver.* 15. wherein hee inferreth a Corollary denying the obtaining of mercy to the means which the creature useth who findeth mercy, *ver.* 16.

Secondly, by declaring and setting forth the right God challengeth to himself, to stirre up a sinfull Creature to this purpose, to shew his power on him, though it bee in his just hardning and overthrow, *ver.* 17. Where hee inferreth another Corollary arising from both these places, ascribing as well the hardning of the creature that is hardned, as the shewing mercy to him that obtaineth mercy, both to the absolute Soveraignty of Gods will, *ver.* 18.

Exam. This objection ariseth from the consideration of the equality of *Esau* and *Jacob*, before they were born, and whilest they were in their mothers wombe.

The Answer is rightly conceived, as freeing God from injustice, by reason of the soveraignty hee hath over his creatures and liberty thereupon to deale, not onely as here it is expressed in generall, diversly, or unequally with persons equall (for so hee deales even with his Elect) giving a greater measure of grace to one, as even to *Saul* a persecutor and lesse to another though never so morall, and free from such as the world accounts foule sinnes before their callings, but so unequally as to shew mercy unto one, and to deny mercy unto the other. For the more full explication whereof weeare to consider, that righteousnesse or Justice is taken in a double notion. The one is, when

when things are carried towards men according to their works: The other is, when a man doth no other thing then hee hath power to doe; as in executing the power that God hath given them over inferiour Creatures, wee are just though wee doe kill Sheep, or Oxen, &c. Not in reference to any works of theirs, but onely in reference to our own necessary use, and unto that lawfull power which God hath given us to serve our own turns of them. And thus God is not unjust or unrighteous, but righteous and just, in shewing mercy on some, and not on others, when there is no difference between them.

But whereas it is said, *ver.* 16. that the Apostle inferreth a Corollary, denying the obtaining of mercy to the means, which the Creature useth to finde mercy; implying that when the Apostle saith, it is not of him that willeth, and of him that runneth, this of willing and running are the meanes to obtaine mercy.

I no way like this, for if it bee understood of willing and running in a naturall manner, such willing and running are no means to obtain mercy: Or if it bee to bee understood of willing and running in a gracious manner; whosoever thus willeth and runneth hath obtained mercy: as the Apostle signifyeth when hee saith, *I found mercy that I should bee faithfull.* And to obtain mercy in the Apostles phrase, *Rom.* 11. 30. and 31. is clearely to obtain faith and repentance; So that according to this exposition, the meaning of the Apostle is this; though man is hee who beleeveth and repenteth, yet the glory of all is to bee given unto God, as who sheweth mercy to whom hee will, when as freely hee denyeth it to others, and so hardneth them. And that this is the Apostles meaning in this place, it appeareth by the Antithesis which the Apostle makes, between shewing mercy on the one side, and hardning on the other. 1 Cor 7.

Again, whereas the right of God in stirring up a creature to this purpose to shew his power on him, though it bee in his hardning, and overthrow; this right I say, or rather the exercise of this right in God, is confined to a sinfull creature, this is quite besides the Apostles Text; For albeit the creatures hee speaketh of (as *Pharaoh* and the rebellious *Israelites*) were sinfull creatures, yet it doth not follow that the Apostle in the

Doctrine which here hee delivereth, taketh any notice of their sinfulnesse; As indeed it is apparent that hee doth not justifie Gods courses here mentioned upon the consideration of their sinfulnesse, but only upon the consideration of Gods Soveraignty over his creatures. And indeed it is plain, that of two sinners God can give the grace of rising from sin to whom hee will, and deny it unto the other: so it is manifest that of two creatures standing in the estate of grace, God can maintain the one in that estate by his corroborating grace, and by denying the same grace, permit the other to fall from that estate of innocency wherein hee stood; As it is clear in the difference that God put betwixt the Angels that stood, to wit, his elect Angels,) and those that fell; they that stood being *amplius adjuti*, more succoured then the other, as *Austin* professeth, *De Civ. Dei lib.* 12. *cap.* 9. And *Cognatus* at large upon him. So that in this respect the denying of corroborating grace to those Angels that fell, while before they were without sin, was just with God; not in any reference unto their works, as if they had deserved that God should permit them to fall into sin, it being impossible that any creature should deserve this. For in this case there should bee acknowledged a sin to precede the first sin, which cannot bee avouched, without manifest contradiction. But it is just in respect of Gods Soveraignty to keep from sin whom hee will, and to permit whom hee will to fall into sin.

Quest. Thou wilt further say unto me, Why doth hee yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will?

Answ. To this the Apostle returneth answer in foure materiall points.

First, Hee checketh the petulancy of the creature, by shewing that though God should harden the creature by his irresistible will, yet it is not for the creature to reply thus to God; this hee doth by a comparison, arguing Gods Soveraignty over the creature, suitable to the power which the potter hath over the clay, *ver.* 20.

Secondly, hee admitteth a denyall or at least a mitigation of the rigour of that word objected in the manner of Gods hardning by his irresistible will, instead whereof the Apostle implyeth, hee doth rather harden by his suffering and long patience. What if God suffer in long patience, &c. *ver.* 22.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Hee cleareth the justice of God in hardning the creature, by shewing the conditions of those persons, whom hee thus hardneth, not creatures that have done neither good nor evill; but, 1. vessels of wrath, which men are not, till first considered as sinners: 2. fitted, or as it were perfected and ripened unto destruction, which *Ephes.* 2. 2, 3. men are not till after the refusall of the means of grace, *Ephes.* 2. 4. 2 *Chron.* 36. 15, 16. or else after grosse and unnaturall iniquity, *Gen.* 15. 16. compared with *Levit.* 18. 27, 28, 29.

Fourthly, hee declares the holy ends which God aimes at in all this his dealing with vessels of wrath after this manner, which ends are the manifestation, first, of his power and wrath toward the wicked, *ver.* 22. secondly, of the riches of his glorious grace toward the elect, in dealing far otherwise with them, *v.* 23. Rom. 11. 33. *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdome, and of the power of God! how unsearchable are his judgements, and his wayes past finding out! To him bee glory for ever,* Amen.

By this objection arising out of the former Doctrine, namely, that God hath mercy on whom hee will, and hardneth others: hee doth evince that by shewing mercy, is signifyed Gods giving the grace of obedience; by hardning, his denying the same grace of obedience; And withall that by denying this grace it comes to passe, that men cannot obey the will of God, seeing hereby is manifested, that Gods will is not, they should obey, but rather continue in their hardnesse of heart uncured, and consequently in their disobedience, whereupon it seems unreasonable that God should complain of mens disobedience, as oftentimes hee doth, as *Esa.* 1. *Hear, O Heavens, and hearken O Earth, I have nourished and brought up a people, and they have rebelled against mee.* Again, Esa. 65. *All the day long have I stretched out my hands unto a people that walk in a way that is not good, even after their own imaginations,* And Jer. 8. 7. *Even the Stork in the aire, knoweth her appointed times, and the Turtle, and the Crane, and the Swallow observeth the time of their comming, but my people knoweth not the judgements of the Lord,* and ver. 6. *I hearkned and heard, but none spake aright, no man repented of his wickednesse, saying, what have I done? Every one turneth into their race, as the horse rusheth into the battle.* And Hos. 7. 14. *Though I have bound and strengthened their arms, yet they have rebelled against mee.* And Exod. 10. 2.

Exam.

Thus

Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, How long wilt thou refuse to humble thy self before mee? Let my people goe that they may serve mee, ver. 4. *But if thou refuse to let my people goe, behold, to morrow I will bring Grashoppers into thine house, &c.* ver. 20. *But the Lord hardned* Pharaohs *heart, and hee did not let the children of Israel goe.* Now this Isay seems most unreasonable in the judgement of flesh and blood. Namely, both to harden a mans heart, and yet to complain of, and finde fault with the hardnesse of his heart, with his rebellion and disobedience, considering that no man can resist his will.

To this the Apostle answereth in certain notable particulars.

First, shewing that when the Scripture doth manifest this to bee Gods course, namely to harden, and yet to complain of a mans hardnesse and disobedience, it becommeth not the creature to quarrell with God, or dispute with God hereabout, because his weak capacity is not able to comprehend the reasonablenesse thereof. As for harding by a will irresistible, implying that there may bee a kinde of harding by a will resistible, as *Arminius* interpreteth the Apostle, it is to put upon the Apostle the conceits of man, for hee maketh no such distinction.

Secondly, Hee proceeds to shew how that God as the Creator, hath power over the creature to dispose of him as he thinks good, in two notable particulars. First, in making him, of what fashion hee will, *ver.* 20. Secondly, in making him to what end hee will, and that without controll from the creature, (the one being answerable to the other) in these words: *Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou made mee thus?* Now these different conditions, as different fashions of a vessell, are to bee conceived in congruous reference to the double act of God formerly mentioned. First, the one was in shewing mercy on whom hee will, whereby a man is made a vessell of grace fit for honour. Secondly, the other was in harding whom hee will, whereby a man left destitute of grace, is exposed to rebellion and disobedience and consequently made a vessell fit for dishonour.

Secondly, to what end hee will, to wit, either to honour or dishonour, that is, either to become finally a vessell of mercy, or a vessell of wrath, like as the potter disposeth of clay in making vessels thereof, answerable hereunto in each particular,

according

according to the meere pleasure of his will.

Thirdly, hee sheweth that the end of all this is threefold.

1. The manifestation of his wrath or justice on the one.

2. The riches of his glory, that is, of his glorious grace on the vessels of mercy.

3. His power and soveraignty in making whom hee will vessels of wrath, or mercy.

Fourthly, hee shews withall, that before the execution of his wrath comes, hee suffers these vessels of wrath with long patience; implying both by this, and by this wrath, that the liberty of the creature in sinning, is nothing prejudiced in all this, and in the course of his patience, way is opened for his complaints and admonitions, and that in pathetical manner, unto these vessels of wrath to move them to repentance. For that God doth complain, and expostulate, and reprove for these their sinfull courses is most evident. And it is no lesse evident that when they goe on in their obstinate courses, not profiting by Gods Word and Works unto Repentance, the cause is (though no culpable cause) that God hath not given them a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to heare, from the first unto the last, *Deut.* 29. 4. That is, that both man runneth on wilfully in his sinfull courses, and that most culpably, and also that without grace it cannot bee otherwise. Though the reconciling of both these bee very obscure and difficult as indeed the providence of God especially in evill, and generally in working what hee will, by the free wills of the creature, is of a most mysterious nature. This patience of God comprehends not Gods bare suffering the wicked only, but his prospering of them also, *Jer.* 12. 1. Why are all they in wealth that rebelliously transgresse? 1. As for the first materiall point of the Apostles answer, I agree with you, in the explication thereof. 2. But as concerning the second, in my judgment there is nothing found.

For first, you feign the rigour of that which was objected to consist in a certain manner of Gods hardning: to wit, by his irresistible will; As if the Apostle did give us to understand, that there is a double kinde of hardning, that is imputed unto God. The one by his irresistible will; the other is not expressed by you, but intimated to consist in hardning by his will resistible, whereas no such distinction is either expressed or insinuated by

the Apostle, neither doe you once goe about to prove it. And the distinction it self is very absurd; both in bringing in a will of God resistible, whereas the Apostle supposeth the will of God in hardning to bee irresistible, without all distinction; neither doth hee give any the least intimation of a twofold hardning used by God, or imputable to him. Hee plainly professeth, that as *God hath mercy on whom hee will*, so *hee hardneth whom hee will*, without all distinction. And you may as well distinguish Gods shewing of mercy, as if that were twofold; one by his will resistible, another by his will irresistible; For shewing mercy and hardning are made opposite by the Apostle. And it is a well known rule in Schooles, that *Quot modis dicitur unum oppositorum, tot modis dicetur & alterum*, of two opposites, look how many wayes the one is taken, so many wayes may the other bee taken. And upon this Doctrine of the Apostle, ariseth the objection to this effect. That seeing Gods will is irresistible in hardning a man; it seems unreasonable that God should complain of such a mans rebellion and disobedience whom himselfe hath hardned, supposing that they cannot obey God who are hardned. And throughout this objection also, there is no colour of any such distinction as you introduce at pleasure, concerning Gods will, as either resistible or irresistible, and accordingly as concerning the different manner of Gods obduration, to wit, either by his resistible will, or by his irresistible will.

Secondly, you feign at pleasure in like manner, a denyall, or at least a mitigation of the rigour of St. *Pauls* former Doctrine, whence rose this objection, (for so I had rather expresse it, then as you doe, when in very obscure manner you call it the rigour of the word objected) And I wonder you would adventure to devise a deniall, or any colour of deniall made by the Apostle of that, which formerly hee delivered in saying, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will, hee hardneth*; when your selfe have not hitherto manifested any minde to deny ought delivered by him, as it is not fit you should. But it may be the rigour mentioned by you, is not conceived to consist in *Pauls* former Doctrine of Gods hardning whom hee will, but rather in complaining of their disobedience whom God himself hath hardned, his will being irresistible. Now this, though amplified as a rigorous thing, the Apostle may seem to deny, or at least mitigate.

But first it seems to mee, that the objection chargeth God not so much with a rigorous course, (for who shall hinder God to deal with any, as rigorously as pleaseth him, there being no injustice in rigour?) as with an unreasonable course. But whether rigorous or unreasonable in shew, the Apostle by saying God suffers them with long patience, doth neither deny, nor any way mitigate the condition of this course of his, for complaining of their disobedience, whom himself hath hardned. For albeit God all the day long, yea, and all the yeer long, yea, and many yeers long, stretcheth out his hands to a people that walk in a way that is not good, even after their own imaginations, such being the hardnesse of their hearts, as even in despight of Gods sufferance of them, and gracious proceedings with them, in the ministry of his word, and sparing them in his works also, yet if God himself continues to harden them, his will being irresistible, Gods complaining of their rebellion and disobedience, seems never a whit the lesse rigorous or unreasonable, according to the objection proposed. For as *Austin* saith, *Contra Julianum Pelag. lib. 5. cap. 4. Quantamlibet præbuerit patientiam, nisi Deus dederit, quis agat pœnitentiam?* though God afford never so great patience, yet unlesse God give [grace] who shall perform repentance? And to say that God doth harden by his long patience, is a strange liberty that you take in interpreting *Paul*. If to harden, bee to suffer with long patience, then to shew mercy, being opposite to hardning must bee not to suffer with long patience. And if to suffer with long patience bee to harden, then as often as hee suffers his own elect with long patience, hee hardneth them. And when St. *Peter* saith, *God is patient toward us*, the meaning in proportion must bee, hee hardens us. Let me tell you, that *Julian* the *Pelagian* of old, took the like advantage as you doe of the word *Patience* in this place to corrupt the Doctrine of St. *Paul*, *lib. 5. contr. Jul. Pelag. cap. 3. Quid est* (saith Austin) *quod dicis*, [*cum desideriis suis traditi dicuntur, relicti per divinam patientiam intelligendi sunt, non per potentiam in peccata compulsi.*] *quasi non simul posuerit hæc duo idem Apostolus, & patientiam & potentiam, ubi ait. Si autem ostendere volens iram & demonstrare potentiam suam, attulit in multa patientia, vasa iræ, quæ perfecta sunt in perditionem: Quid horum tamen dicis esse quod scriptum est. Et propheta si ter venerit & locutus fuerit, ego dominus seduxi prophetam illum: & extendam manum meam,*

super eum & exterminabo eum de medio populi mei Israel, *patientia est, an potentia? Quod libet eligas vel utrumque fateare, vides tamen falsa prophetanti peccatum esse pœnamque peccati. An & hic dicturus es, quod ait,* Ego dominus seduxi prophetam illum, *intelligendum esse deservui, ut pro ejus meritis seductus erraret? Age ut vis, tamen ea moda punitus est pro peccato: ut falsum prophetando peccaret, sed illud intuere quod vidit* Micheas *propheta,* Dominum *sedentem super thronum suum, & omnis exercitus cæli stabat circa eum, a dextris ejus, & a sinistris ejus. Et dixit dominus, Quis seducet* Achab *Regem* Israelis, *& ascendet & cadet in* Ramoth Gilead? *& dixit iste sic, & iste sic. Et exiit spiritus & stetit in conspectu Domini; & dixit. Ego seducam eum. Et dixit Dominus ad eum, in quo? Et dixit, exibo, & ero spiritus mendax in ore omnium prophetarum ejus. Et dixit, Seduces & prævalebis, exi & fac sic. Quid ad ista dicturus es? Nempe Rex ipse peccavit falsis credendo prophetis. At hæc ipsa erat & pœna peccati, Deo judicante, Deo mittente, angelum malum. Ut apertius intelligeremus, quomodo in psalmo dictum sit, Misisse iram indignationis suæ, per angelos malos. Sed numquid errando, numquid injuste quicquam aut temere judicando, sive faciendo? Absit. Sed non frustra illi dictum est, Judicia tua sicut abyssus multa. Non frustra exclamat Apostolus, O altitudo divitiarum sapientiæ & scientiæ Dei! quam inscrutabilia sunt judicia ejus, & investigabiles viæ ejus! Quis enim cognovit sensum Domini, aut quis consiliarius ejus fuit, aut quis prior dedit illi, ut retribuatur ei?* And again in the same Chapter, *Sequitur propter hoc, Tradidit illos Deus in passiones ignominiæ. Audis propter hoc, & quæris inaniter quomodo intelligendus sit tradere Deus, multum laboramus, ut ostendas eum tradere deserendo: sed quomodo libet tradat, propter hoc tradidit. Propter hoc deseruit, & vides ejus traditionem, qualem libet, & quomodo libet intelligas, quæ consentia sint. Curavit enim Apostolus dicere, quanta pœna sit a Deo tradi passionibus ignominiæ, sive deserendo, sive alio quocunque, vel explicabili, vel inexplicabili modo quo facit hoc summe bonus, & ineffabiliter justus.*

Thirdly, as touching the third, there is as little sounding in that also, for already you have confessed, that the Apostle in answering this objection, to justifie God, hath recourse to Gods soveraignty over his creatures, as great as the potter hath over the clay, who maketh vessels of what fashion hee will, and to what end hee will. But in the last place you feign most unreason-

reaſonably, a juſtification of Gods courſe in hardning whom hee will, from the conſideration of the perſons hardned, as being ſinners. I ſay this is moſt unreaſonable.

Firſt, becauſe when the creature is dealt withall according to his deſerts, this alone is moſt ſufficient and ſatisfactory to every one that acknowledgeth it, for the juſtification of any courſe taken with ſuch. And it is meerly in vain to fly to any other courſe of juſtification, eſpecially when it is leſſe ſatisfactory then this. And how ſtrange were it, that the Apoſtle ſhould inſiſt ſo fully and directly upon that other courſe of ſatisfaction, upon the conſideration of Gods ſoveraignty, and ſhould onely intimate this, and that obſcurely, when this doth afford farre better ſatisfaction then the former.

Secondly, in this caſe, there were no ground for any ſuch objection, nor any colour of unreaſonableneſſe, if God did but deale with them according to their deſerts, as often as hee hardneth them.

Thirdly, the objection ariſeth not upon Gods hardning a man ſimply, but upon the hardning of whom hee will, and that in a conjunct conſideration, with his ſhewing mercy therewithall on whom hee will. In which caſe if God bee juſtifyed from the conſideration of their conditions with whom hee deales, like as hee dealeth differently with them, in ſhewing mercy on ſome, and hardning others, ſo there ſhould bee acknowledged a different condition, in the perſons with whom God dealeth in ſo different a manner. But it is confeſſed by you, that the perſons here in St. *Pauls* conſideration are equall, with whom nevertheleſſe God deales very unequally.

Fourthly, though this bee a plauſible courſe in the judgement of man, eſpecially of the Arminians, for the ſmothering of the light of Gods truth in this place, yet when it is well conſidered, in the proper nature of it, I preſume it will bee very diſſonant unto common reaſon. For what I pray you is hardning in this place, ſtanding in oppoſition to the ſhewing of mercy, but onely the denying of the grace of Faith and Repentance to them that heare the Goſpel; like as to ſhew mercy is to give the grace of Faith and Repentance, as appeareth manifeſtly, both by the ſame phraſe uſed, *Rom.* 11. 30, 31. and alſo by this very place cleering it ſelf? For it is ſuch an operation whereupon it will

follow, that God ſhall have cauſe or occaſion to complain, as appeareth by the objection moved hereupon. Now I ſay, to deny Faith and Repentance is not of the nature of a puniſhment, neither can it bee ſaid with ſobriety, that man by ſin doth deſerve that God ſhould deny him faith and repentance, like as it cannot bee with ſobriety affirmed, that man by being ſick, hath deſerved that the Phyſitian ſhould not cure him: or that man being dead, hath deſerved thereby that God ſhould not raiſe him from death; whereas indeed a man could not bee raiſed from death, unleſſe hee were firſt dead, nor cured unleſſe firſt ſick, neither were there any need of Faith in Chriſt crucifyed, and of repentance, unleſſe man were a ſinner.

Laſtly, conſider, as there is a grace of raiſing from out of ſin, ſo there is a grace of preſerving from ſin. This grace God granted to the elect Angels, hee denyed to the reſt, meerly out of his own free pleaſure, according to the Soveraignty hee hath over his creatures, and not with any reference unto ſin preceding. For how was that poſſible? namely, that there could bee any ſin found in Angels before their firſt ſin? yet were the one, (to wit) the elect Angels *amplius adjuti*, more ſuccoured then the other, as *Auſtin* expreſſely profeſſeth, *lib.* 12. *De Civ. Dei. cap.* 9. Indeed I finde *Epheſ.* 2. 3. That wee are born children of wrath, in reſpect of ſin, but that ſin makes a man a veſſell of wrath, or that hee is not a veſſell of wrath till ſin comes, the Apoſtle ſaith not; nay, the Apoſtle intimates the contrary, when hee repreſents the power of God over his creatures, by the power of the Potter over the Clay, in making therehence one veſſell to honour, and another to diſhonour. It is true, ſince the fall of *Adam*; man in his generation hath no being without ſin; (for wee are even conceived in ſin) yet it is not that ſin, that makes a man a veſſell of wrath, for if it did, then all ſhould bee made by God veſſels of wrath. But albeit the Apoſtle ſignifies that wee are all born children of wrath, which is verifyed in reſpect of the deſert, even of ſin originall, yet neither Apoſtle nor Prophet doth any where give us to underſtand, that all men are made veſſels of wrath. This phraſe includes, firſt, the intention of God like a Potter, to make ſuch uſe of them, as to make his juſt wrath appeare upon them, and this purpoſe of God was everlaſting, not onely as old as every mans generation, but as

old as the creation of all, yea, and from everlaſting before the Creation. Secondly, it includes alſo a fitneſſe in the veſſell for ſuch an uſe, not fitneſſe in the way of deſert only; (ſuch fitneſſe being found in all the naturall ſons of *Adam*) but fitneſſe in reſpect of Gods purpoſe to ſhew wrath. Now like as in proportion hereunto, the making of a man fit for mercy, is the giving of him grace; ſo the denying of grace finally makes him fit for wrath in this ſenſe, for as much as God will damn none but ſuch as die in their ſins. Here I ſpeak of wrath and mercy, as they conſiſt in giving ſalvation, or inflicting damnation.

Laſtly, if none are ripened for deſtruction, till the refuſall of meanes of grace, or the committing of groſſe and unnaturall iniquity, then it followeth, that no Infants of Turks and Sarecens are veſſels of wrath; No, nor men of ripe yeers amongſt the heathen, many of whom never having either refuſed the meanes of grace (for as much as they never injoyed them) and having lived civilly and morally all their dayes, Philoſopher-like, free from groſſe and unnaturall iniquity. And though all this bee granted you; yet if God to that end refuſe to ſhew mercy on them, in giving them Faith and Repentance, and continues to harden them by denying ſuch grace, look how rigorous or unreaſonable ſoever the objection pretended Gods courſe to bee, in complaining of them for their diſobedience, when God himſelf hath hardned them, in the ſame degree of rigour and unreaſonableneſſe, it continues ſtill without all mitigation, notwithſtanding all that you have ſaid hitherto to the contrary.

Fourthly, as for the fourth, I have no deſire to quarrell with you thereabout; Gods judgements indeed, *Rom.* 11. 33. that is, his *agendi rationes* (as *Piſcator* interpreteth it) are unſearchable, and his wayes paſt finding out. But you take a courſe quite contrary, to make them nothing unſearchable, but eaſie to be found out. For if obduration bee in reſpect of ſin, ſurely there is no unſearchable depth in this. And in my opinion, the chief wayes of God, which the Apoſtle aimes at in the place alledged, conſiſts in having mercy on whom hee will, and hardning whom he will, and in generall thus in proportion to that which goeth before; There was a time when God had a Church without diſtinction of Jews and Gentiles, as before the Flood, and after,

till

till the bringing of the children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*: Again, there was a time after this, for about 1600. yeers, that God had a Church of the Jews in distinction from the Gentiles. And since that for the space of about 1600. yeers, God hath had a Church among the Gentiles in distinction from the Jews. And we look for a time to come when God shall have a Church, and that here on earth, consisting both of the Nation of the Jews, and of the Nations of the Gentiles. Three of these states are signifyed by the Apostle immediately before, *Rom.* 11. 30. *For even as yee in time past, have not beleeved God, yet have now obtained mercy, through their unbelief*, there have wee two of them; one past, another then present: Then follows the third, *ver.* 31. *Even so now have they not beleeved by the mercy shewed unto you*; (this is part of the second) *that they also may obtain mercy.* This is the third, which wee look for, *ver.* 32. *For God hath shut up all in unbelief, that hee might have mercy upon all.* Then follows the exclamation, *ver.* 33. *O the deepnesse of the riches both of the wisdome and knowledge of God* (for hee knows all courses possible to bee taken, both wise and unwise, and out of the depth of his wisdome makes choyce of what hee thinks fit) *O how unsearchable are his judgements*, (for out of all these different courses, results such a splendor of the glory of God, as no creature (till it bee revealed) can project, nor devise any courses countervailable thereunto, when it is revealed) *and his wayes past finding out!*

FINIS.

The Engliſh of the Latine paſſages in this Treatiſe, in the ſeverall Pages thereof, that are not formerly engliſhed.

PAge 10. lin. 2, 3, 4. *The Apoſtle ſaith that we are choſen in Chriſt, as in a Mediatour, by whoſe blond ſalvation is procured for us.* lin. 5. *As touching the act of God chooſing.* lin. 17, 18. *as in the head.* —*The nature of an head, is not the nature of a cauſe meritorious.* lin. 19, 20, 21. *The Apoſtle ſaith that we are elect in Chriſt, as in a Mediatour, by whoſe blond life is procured for us.* —l. 21. *a meritorious cauſe.* lin. 22, 23, 24. *and as in an head, from whence theſe good things are derived to us. So that the reaſon of an head, is the reaſon of a meritorious cauſe, not morally, but naturally.* l. 26. *as in the head.* l. 27. *as dead and raiſed again.* l. 37. *Chriſt is the head of the predeſtinate.*

Page 11. lin. 5, 6. *The other reaſon concerning Chriſt conſidered as the head, ſeemeth to depend on theſe parts.*

Page 12, l. 5. *a thing being by accident.* l. 28. *Predeſtination puts nothing in the thing predeſtinated.* l. 31. *in all things.*

Page 13. lin. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. *By the comparing of which ſentence it appeares, that the Greek* ἐν πᾶσιν *is here rightly rendred,* among all. *It is a Greek phraſe, leſt ſome one might conceive it ought to be tranſlated,* in all; *to wit,* in all things. *We are to remember, that the Apoſtle from this verſe began to diſcourſe of Chriſts kingdom in his Church, which no man will deny, if hee doth but lightly conſider the very words themſelves: and therefore under the univerſall particle, no other thing is comprehended, but all believers of all times.* —*Chriſt is the firſt of them that riſe again, that among all the Saints, both of them that went before and of them that came after, he might have the primacy of dignity, power, and holineſſe.* —*that ſo among all hee might have the preheminence; not onely in reſpect of men, but alſo of all angels.* lin. 23, 24, 25, 26. *that alwayes in every life he may be chiefe and principall: in grace and glory: in generation and reſurrection: as well in viſible as in inviſible creatures.*

Page 14. lin. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25. *If Chriſts predeſtination and ours be conſidered, as touching the act of God predeſtinating, ſo the one is not the cauſe of the other; for the ſame thing cannot be the cauſe of it ſelfe: but by the ſame divine act both Chriſt and we are predeſtinated; therefore the predeſtination of Chriſt is not the cauſe of our predeſtination. But if it be conſidered as touching the effect, ſeeing the effect of our*

predestination is grace and glory, and the adoption of sonnes; so it is to be said, that the predestination of Christ is the cause of our predestination, both the cause efficient and the cause exemplary. l. 32. *first.* l. 33. *latter.*

Page 15. lin. 28, 29, &c. *a being by accident.*

Page 16. l. 14. *God only permitting them as they are evill.* lin. 16, 17. *not any thing comes to passe unlesse God will have it come to passe, either by suffering it to come to passe, or himselfe working it.*

Page 21. l. 3. *the reason whereof is derived from the reason of the end designed.*

Page 26. l. 10. *the reason of the end.*

Page 27. lin. last thirteen. 1. *Of all things which God from everlasting did in his mind devise to doe, the first was the hypostaticall union of the divine Word. The second was the predestination of all the elect. The third was the condition of the nature of things. And therefore supernaturals are before naturals; and the order of nature presupposeth the order of grace.*

2 *The fore-knowledge of no future thing is in the mind of God supposed to goe before predestination, but all things follow from it: and so farforth, that God decreed nothing at all from eternity to doe, nor in time doth, he permits nothing, or intends, whether naturall or supernaturall, whether it be of great weight, or of least weight, or of no weight, which proceeds not there-hence, and is the effect and means of the predestination of the elect and of Christ. So that all things fall under the order of the divine predestination, as means ordained to the glory of Christ and of his Saints.*

Pag. 28. 3. *There is no other providence in God preceding predestination, to wit, from which providence proceed things naturall, and some other effects supernaturall; but there is one onely providence, and that is predestination, from which all things throughout proceed, without all exception. So that according to this conclusion, the whole universe, as it comprehends things naturall and supernaturall, things good and evill, substances and accidents, and all wayes throughout of being and working, not onely in generall, but in speciall and individuall, are to be considered as the onely totall object of divine predestination; so that not any one thing is without the breadth of its object, and which falls not under that act of predestination.*

4. *If there had not been a predestination of Gods elect, nothing at all had been in the nature of things. Therefore I hold this as certaine, that unlesse Christ had been to come into the world, there had been no predestination of the elect made by God; and if no predestination had been, by vertue whereof all things follow, there should have been neither heaven, nor earth, nor other elements, nor living things, nor men, nor angels, nor sins, nor devils, nor reprobates; and last of all, that I may conclude in one word,*

God

God alone had been, and nothing else had been besides God, neither naturall nor supernaturall, neither good nor evill; we speak according to the common law and order of things, and according to those ends which probably we conceive God to have had in the making of creatures. For our purpose is not at all so to tye the majesty of the divine power to the weaknesse of our apprehensions, to deny that God could (such is his absolute power) make and ordaine the nature of things without dependance upon grace and glory, and grace without dependance upon Christ our Lord.

Pag. ibid. five last lines. *Behold where, look by what reason Christ is said to be Gods, and the predestinate are said to be Christs; by the same reason all naturall things, whether present or to come, whether life or death, are said to be the predestinates owne things: But so it is, that Christ is therefore said to be Gods, and the elect are said to be Christs, because*

Pag. 29. *God is the end of Christ, and Christ is the end of the elect; that is, because Christ is ordained unto God as unto the end, and the elect unto Christ, as unto the end: and unlesse hee, that is, God, were the first end, or the manifestation of his glory, there should be no Christ; and if there were no Christ, there should be no elect: therefore altogether by the same reason, the creatures are therefore said to be theirs who are elect, because they are for the elect, and the elect are the ends of them; and so if the elect should not have been, no natures of the creatures should have been.*

Pag. ibid. l. 9, 10, &c. *He hath chosen us in him before the constitution of the world. Now hee speaks of Christ man, to wit, of Christ the head, as Hierome expresseth upon that place, and it appeares most plainly by the text. Certainly, either I am deceived, or Saint* Paul *intends not that onely, to wit, that God hath chosen us in Christ, before the true and reall constitution of the world, which was made in time now six thousand yeares agoe. For that God had chosen us in Christ before the temporall creation of all things, was no great thing, nor worthy of so great a pen; for so he chose oxen and stones: For he decreed them, and fore-saw them, before the creation of things in time, or before he made any thing in time; now before the constitution of the world, and from everlasting he devised them, and determined to make them. Therefore* Paul *intends some higher and more divine matter; to wit, that God in his eternity, when he devised with himselfe the creation of the world, even before that in order of reason he devised with himselfe concerning the election of his elect; and even then (I say) he had intended and fore-seen Christ, and in him he had chosen the predestinate.* — lin. 27, 28, &c. *a most efficacious reason; Every one willing things ordinately, first willeth the end; and of means those means which are nearer to the end: But Christ and the predestinate, and therefore all supernaturals are nearer to the end, that is, to the manifestation*

of the divine goodneſſe, than all naturall things; therefore ſupernaturals are willed by God before naturals; and the manifeſtation of the goodneſſe of God before them all; becauſe we conſider it as the end of all. — lin. 37,38. *After what order and manner things are determined with God.*

Pag.30.lin.6.to.15. Thomas *is of opinion, that Chriſt ſhould never have been predeſtinated if man had not ſinned. Whence it ſeemeth to follow by conſequence, that ſinne was firſt ſeen by God, and the permiſſion thereof willed, before the incarnation of the Word was willed: So that in the way of the* Thomiſts, *it appeares not how it can ſtand, that the firſt decree of God was the incarnation or predeſtination of the Word, if ſo be the permiſſion and fore-ſight of ſin was before it: but if Chriſt were predeſtinate before ſin was fore-ſeen, then though ſin had not been yet Chriſt ſhould have come into the world, who was predeſtinate before the fore-ſight of ſin.* lin.30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38. *That God did firſt will the hypoſtaticall union and incarnation of the Word, before he willed the permiſſion of ſin, and before he determined to make the nature of man, and of the whole univerſe* — *Yet becauſe the incarnation was not willed without the conſideration of ſin, but was willed dependently upon the permiſſion of ſin, and of the nature of things, as upon the meanes; therefore it followeth not, that Chriſt ſhould come into the world if ſinne had not entred, or if the world had not at all been.* — *means tending to the incarnation of Chriſt.*

Pag.32.l.20. *From the greatneſſe of the remedy, take notice of the greatneſſe of the danger.*

Pag.36.l.26. *beyond the worthineſſe of it.* l.27. *leſſe then it deſerves.*

Pag.40.l.4. *who by profiting write, and by writing profit.* l.16. *the maſſe not made.* l.17. *made — not yet corrupted.* l.18. *the maſſe corrupt.*

Pag.41.lin.23. *the maſſe not yet created.* l.28. *the maſſe corrupt.*

Pag.43.lin.34,35. *God willed glory unto* Peter, *he willed nothing unto* Judas. l.36. *God willed grace unto* Peter, *hee willed nothing unto* Judas. — l.37. *God would have each of them to exiſt in the corrupt maſſe.*

Pag.44.l.2. *It is ſomething to come thus farre.* l.4. *will damnation unto* Judas. l.14. *of every thing that is, and of every thing that is not.* l.33, 34. *If God did not will glory to* Judas, *then God did will that hee ſhould have no glory.*

Pag.45.l.13. *to hate.* l.14. *not to will grace and glory to ſome one.*

Pag.47.l.23. *as a crown of juſtice.*

Pag.51.l.25,26. *Reprobation includes the will of ſuffering ſin, and inflicting damnation for ſin.*

Pag.53.l.22. *We know.* l.23. *not onely wills averſe from faith, but wills adverſe to faith.* l.29. *Of the vocation of the Gentiles.*

Pag.54.l.20. *in the maſſe from the beginning corrupt.*

Page 55.l.34. *in the masse of Adam.* lin.36,37. *to consider, — to erre or feign.* lin.27,28. *as to come in the masse of Adam.*

Page 56.lin.5,6. *as should be faithfull, and repent, and persevere in faith and repentance.*

Pag.59.lin.13,14. *Let me not live if I delight in the death of a wicked man; but I delight when a wicked man returns, that hee may live.* lin.21,22. *Because our defections and our sins lye upon us, therefore we pine away in them, and should we live.* lin.24,25,26. *Say unto them, Let me not live, saith the Lord, if I delight in the death of the wicked, but when the wicked returnes from his way, that hee may live. Returne ye, returne yee from your most evill wayes; for why should yee die, O house of Israel?*

Pag.60.lin.3,4. *by almighty facility convert, — and of unwilling make them willing?* lin.38. *the will of signe, — the will of good pleasure;* l.39. *the will of precept.*

Pag.61.l.1. *the will of purpose.* l.14. *the will of sign, and the will of good pleasure.*

Pag.63.l.18. *as touching the act of God willing.* l.19. *as touching the things willed.*

Pag.67.l.20. *the decrees being changed the Court of heaven had mourned.* lin.24. *in a greater measure succoured.*

Pag.68.lin.23,24. *Not any thing comes unlesse God will have it come to passe, either by suffering it to come to passe, or himselfe working it.* l.25. *suffers to come to passe, hee will have it come to passe.*

Pag.69.l.11. *middle knowledge.* l.21. *in part.* lin.22. *simply, or thoroughly.*

Pag.71.l.2,3. *the pride of man is wont to say, If I had known it, I would have done it.*

Pag.72.l.32. *This is an hard saying.*

Pag.76.l.1,2,&c. *Each part of man (the spirit and the heart, that is the superiour and inferiour) ill disposed by God, understand it negatively, as touching the giving of free grace, but positively, as touching the judgement, inclination to, and prosecution of a sensible good. So that God made the Kings spirit hard (that is, not yeelding to the requests made) and not giving him grace to yeeld, and working with him to the affection of security, and his own good.*

Pag.77.lin.31,32. *by works, — by writing.*

Pag.78.lin.16,17. *How great patience soever God affords, who will repent unlesse God give repentance?*

Pag.79.l.11,12. *that they may profit so farre, as to performe outward repentance, that so their punishment may be the lesse.* l.24,25. *by will of precept, — by will of purpose or good pleasure.*

Pag.82.l.4. *that hee might afflict thee.* l.28. *of duty. — by conformity to the affections of men.*

Pag.86.l.6,7. *Fair Laverna, teach me to deceive, teach me to seem just and holy: Cast darknesse over my sins, and a cloud over my deeds.*

lin.38,39. *Liberty without grace is not liberty, but wilfulnesse.*

Pag.89.l.3. *doe that which is just.* l.4. *because they will not.* —*why will they not?* l.5. *we goe further,* —*without prejudice of a more diligent search,* l.6,7. *Either because the goodnesse of it lies hid, or because 'tis such as delights not.* l.8. *but that, what lay hid is made known, and that is made sweet which formerly did not delight, this is from the grace of God which succoureth mens wills.* l.34, 35. *averse from true faith, but adverse to true faith.*

Pag.94.l.27,28. *whom no mans will resists;* —*for of unwilling he makes them willing.* l.32,33. *the pride of man is wont to say, Had I known it, I would have done it.*

Pag.95.l.5,6. *faith is the cause of salvation.* —*cause meritorious.* l.7. *cause of damnation.* —*causes disposing.*

Pag.97.l.3. *Of the vocation of Gentiles.*

Pag.99.l.34. *justice of condecency.*

Pag.105.l.29. *university of elect.* —*a world of elect.* l.30. *Of the vocation of Gentiles.*

Pag.108.l.10. *the will cannot be constrained.* lin.15,16. *God by almighty ease converts men, and of unwilling makes them willing.*

Pag.109.l.21. *in the masse at the first corrupt.*

Pag.111.l.24. *of former and latter.*

Pag.114.lin.31,32. *includes the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for sin.* l.36. *the criticall point.*

Pag.115.l.33. *the outward works of the Trinity are indivisible.*

Pag.121.l.2. *such as should be saved.*

Pag.122.l.1,2. *they encreased the errour concerning God.* —*they took away the feare of God.*

Pag.125.l.11,12. *into a mind void of all judgement.* l.20. *from the beginning.*

Pag.127.l.10. *of old fore-written to this judgement.*

Pag.129.l.28. *the pure masse.* l.29. *the corrupt masse.*

Pag.131.l.38. *suits at law.*

Pag.133.lin.31,32,33. *moreover this metaphor is taken from hence, that Gods eternall, whereby the believers are ordained to salvation, is called a book.*

Pag.137.l.24. *righteousnesse of condecency.*

Pag.140.l.20,21. *The love of good liking.* —*the love of well-doing.*

Pag.141.l.10. *the will of the flesh.* l.25. *to an outward amendment of life.*

Pag.146.l.11. *is not liberty, but contumacy.*

Pag.147.l.15,16,17,18,19,20,21. *what patience soever God shewes, yet who shall repent unlesse God gives repentance.* —*None of these whom God hath not predestinated, doth God bring unto true and wholsome repentance, whereby*

whether they be reconciled unto God in Christ, whether hee affords them
larger patience, more grace, ——— God brings to repentance, but whom?
whom hee hath predestinated.

Pag.185.lin.9,10. *more helped.* l.11,12. *to be able if hee would.* ——— *to will what he could.* l.13. *helpe or succours.*

Pag.187.l.22. *as touching the act of God predestinating.* l.23. *as touching the act of God reprobating.* l.25. *as touching the act of God willing.*

Pag.191.l.4. *not by infusing malice or naughtinesse, but by not infusing grace.*

Pag.193.l.15. *no man becomes most foule at first.* l.18. *No old man fears God.*

Pag.195.lin.21,22. *The same, as the same, always works the same.*

Pag.202.l.12. *unequall heifers are not fit to plough under the same yoke.*

Pag.203.l.17. *by infusing malice, but by not infusing grace.*

Pag.205.l.3. *not as touching the affection,* l.4. *but as touching the effect.*

Pag.212.l.15. *In the generall lurk many equivocations.*

Pag.224.lin.27,28,29. *Thou art under the wrath of God,* — *therefore worship God who is easie to be intreated. For upon thy prayers hee will pardon thee, and his anger will be appeased.*

Pag.227.l.27. *of duty, not of fact.*

Pag.229.lin.17,18,19,20,21,22,23. *To God, without doubt, look how easie it is to doe what he will, as easie it is not to suffer that to be which he will not have to be. Unlesse we believe this, wee must renounce the first article of our Creed, whereby wee professe to believe in God the Father, who is almighty. For he is not called omnipotent, but to shew, that whatsoever hee will doe, that he can doe; neither can the effect of an almighty power be hindered, by the will of any creature.*

Pag.230.lin.28,29. *Exhortation not made, but despised.* l.32. *if I had known it, I would have done it;* ——— *if I had heard, I would have believed.*

Pag.232.l.33. *on Gods part,* ——— *on mans part.*

Pag.258.lin.7,8. *O Roman, thou dost undeservedly suffer for the sins of thine Ancestors.*

Pag.262.lin.31,32. *that they may profit to the outward amendment of their life, to the end that their punishment may be the milder.*

Pag.263.l.24. *the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for their sin.*

Pag.283.lin.31,&c. *what is this that you say, [when they are said to be given over to their lusts, they are to be understood, as men left by divine patience, not compelled into sins by Gods power] as if the Apostle had not put both these together, both patience and power, when hee saith, But if God willing to shew wrath, and demonstrate his power, suffered in much patience the vessels of Gods wrath, fitted, or prepared, for destruction. Yet which of these two doe you say is that which is written? And the Prophet if hee shall erre, and speake, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet: and I will*

stretch

strength was mine arme upon him, and the hand of me of the nobles of my people Israel. In this patience or power I choose which you will, or confesse both.

Yet you see, that the sin of him who prophecyeth falsly, is also a punishment of sin. And when it is said, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet: will you say here also, that this is to be understood as if it were said, I have deserted him, that by reason of his merits he is seduced that he might erre? Be it so, if you will; yet after this manner he was punished for his sins, that by prophecying that which was false hee might sin. But look unto that which the Prophet Micheas saw, to wit, The Lord sitting upon his throne, and the whole army of heaven stood about him, on his right hand, and on his left: And the Lord said, Who shall perswade Ahab the King of Israel, that he may goe up and fall at Ramoth Gilead? and one spake on this manner, and another on that. And there came forth a Spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will perswade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will goe forth, and will be a lying Spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets. But this very thing was also a punishment of sin, God judging, God sending an evill Angel: That wee may more clearly understand, how it is said in the Psalme, that he sent the wrath of his indignation by evill Angels. But did God erre in this? did he judge or doe ought unjustly or rashly in this? Farre be it from us so to think. But the Prophet spake not in vaine, when hee said, Thy judgements are a great depth. The Apostle doth not cry out in vaine, when hee saith, O the depth of the riches of the wisdome and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgements, and his wayes past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his Counsellour? or who first gave unto him, that hee might be recompensed? And againe, in the same Chapter it followeth: For this cause God gave them over to the lusts of uncleanesse. You heare, that for this God gave them over; and you vainly inquire, How it is to be understood, that God gave them over? taking much paines to shew, that God gives men over in such manner, by deserting them: But after what manner soever God gives them over, for this cause God gave them over: For this hee deserted them. And you see Gods giving of them over, what kind of desertion soever it be, and after what manner soever you understand the things which followed hereupon. For the Apostles care was to shew, how great a punishment it is, to be given over of God to the lusts of uncleanesse, whether by forsaking them, or after what other manner soever; whether explicable or inexplicable, whereby God doth this, who is both good and just in an unspeakable manner.

FINIS.